



# **PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA**

## **TRANSCRIPT**

### **HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

### **ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A**

Hon. Kerry Vincent MLC

**Tuesday 18 November 2025**

### **MEMBERS**

Ms Helen Burnet (Chair)  
Mr Marcus Vermeij (Deputy Chair)  
Hon Josh Willie  
Ms Kristie Johnston

### **OTHER PARTICIPATING MEMBERS**

Ms Brown  
Mr Di Falco  
Mr Jaensch  
Mr Bayley  
Mr O'Byrne

## **IN ATTENDANCE**

### **HON. KERRY VINCENT MLC**

Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Local Government, Minister for Housing and Planning

### **Infrastructure and Transport portfolio**

#### **Tim Lovibond**

Chief of Staff

#### **Craig Limkin**

Secretary, Department of State Growth

#### **Cynthia Heydon**

Deputy Secretary, Transport, Department of State Growth

#### **Anthony Reid**

Acting Deputy Secretary, Strategy, Housing, Infrastructure and Planning

#### **Ben Goodsir**

Chief Executive Officer, Infrastructure Tasmania, Department of State Growth

#### **Ben Moloney**

Executive Director, Major Transport Projects, Department of State Growth

#### **Lia Morris**

Chief Executive Officer, Marine and Safety Tasmania

#### **Travis Boucher**

Director Finance, Department of State Growth

### **Ministerial Staff**

#### **Trent Dann**

Senior Adviser

#### **Richard Wilson**

Senior Adviser

#### **Todd Newett**

Senior Adviser

### **Housing and Planning portfolio**

#### **Tim Lovibond**

Chief of Staff

#### **Craig Limkin**

Secretary, Department of State Growth

**Anthony Reid**

Acting Deputy Secretary, Strategy, Housing, Infrastructure and Planning, Department of state Growth

**Eleri Morgan-Thomas**

Chief Executive Officer, Homes Tasmania

**Kym Warner**

Chief Financial Officer, Homes Tasmania

**Richard Gilmour**

Director Community Infrastructure, Homes Tasmania

**Jessemy Stone**

Director Housing Policy and Programs, Homes Tasmania

**Travis Boucher**

Director Finance, Department of State Growth

**Ministerial Staff**

**Victoria Matterson**

Senior Adviser

**Adele Fenwick**

Senior Adviser



## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - The time being 5.16 p.m., I welcome everybody to the scrutiny of the Housing and Planning portfolio and I welcome the minister and other witnesses to the committee. I invite the minister to introduce persons at the table for the benefit of Hansard.

**Mr VINCENT** - On my left I have Tim Lovibond, my chief of staff; Anthony Reid, Acting Deputy Secretary Strategy, Housing, Infrastructure and Planning; Craig Limkin, Secretary; and Eleri Morgan-Thomas, CEO of Homes Tasmania.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. The time scheduled for Estimates of the Minister for Housing and Planning is three hours and we'll take a 10-minute break around 6:30 p.m. The committee has asked that we look at Housing first, so we can kick off with that. Would you like to make a brief opening statement?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, I would. Good afternoon, all. I'm pleased to be at my first budget Estimates hearing as Minister for Housing and Planning. This is a portfolio very close to my heart and one in which I want to be able to make a positive difference.

The funding provided in the Budget recognises the government's acknowledgement of the need to support the most vulnerable in our community with the provision of social and affordable housing and crisis supports. We provide to Homes Tasmania funding to cover both operational expenses and borrowing costs associated with meeting capital expenditure requirements, a vital part of Homes Tasmania's work. This capital expenditure is predominantly funded through borrowings from TASCORP, with debt servicing costs guaranteed by the Treasurer through appropriation. Using borrowings and Homes Tasmania's existing funding, we're investing around \$230 million this year alone in building new social and affordable rental housing, MyHome investments, modular homes and land subdivision works.

Homes Tasmania's forward delivery plan sees a target of 839 new homes in the 2026 financial year. This will include 223 social housing properties, 167 affordable rentals, 372 home purchases and the sale of 77 lots of land. Rate of delivery is expected to accelerate from 2027 with Homes Tasmania Future Fund projects and major land developments progress. We have an increased push for more one- and two-bedroom properties to meet the housing requirements of the Housing Register. We have seen a real shift over time in the housing needs of Tasmanians and are working hard to target our new housing builds to address these requirements.

I want to note we are implementing all the recommendations of the Crawford review into Homes Tasmania and are looking closely at what further measures we can make to increase the housing stock of social and affordable homes, plus assisting more Tasmanians into their own homes. MyHome's Shared Equity Program has helped enable first home buyers into their own homes, with 900 mortgages being entered into since the program commenced in July 2022. MyHome doesn't just support Tasmanians into homes. It also supports the construction industry by assisting Tasmanians and their builders to sell or contract the construction of nearly 270 new homes since July 2022.

I am under no illusion of the seriousness of the state and national issues of crisis for social and affordable housing. I believe I have the growing knowledge, passion and commitment to bring some fresh thinking and direction to these issues and that's what I'm here to do.

## PUBLIC

The 2025-26 Budget provides \$2.2 million for the State Planning Office in supporting the planning system and working with key stakeholders, especially local government, including in the core funding of \$385,000 for planning system reforms, which were originally announced in the 2021-22 state budget. The Budget also provides an additional \$300,000 to support clinical [?? think he means critical!] major projects and strategic regional development. I'm pleased to announce that tomorrow I'll be releasing the Tasmanian Planning Policy. The rest of that I might just leave, being planning things for later on, and just say I'm happy to take questions.

**Ms BROWN** - Minister, there is evidence that suggests that prolonged exposure to mould is harmful; would you agree with that?

**Mr VINCENT** - From what I understand of mould, that's quite correct.

**Ms BROWN** - Do you believe that mould in social housing homes is acceptable?

**Mr VINCENT** - Mould in anybody's house is an awkward thing, and it depends on the house and construction and what's being done in the house while the mould is there, but mould is a general thing is not acceptable in the home.

**Ms BROWN** - Residents in my electorate have complained about mould and they've been told by Homes Tasmania that they are okay to stay there; would you agree with that given you've just said it's unacceptable?

**Mr VINCENT** - I will go back to part of that answer where I said it depends on the level of mould and to what extent when they inspect the homes. I might ask Eleri, would you like to expand on the - when the maintenance people go to check on the different levels of mould in the homes.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - It's not uncommon that we will get our hygienist into to actually assess the level of moulds in the house and give us advice on that, if it's a significant mould build up. I just will note that last financial year we sent 133 claims to our insurer around mould. It's a significant problem in our portfolio to deal with. We give advice to tenants on how they can manage mould in their properties, because a small amount of mould is caused by a failure of the fabric of the building.

We have to fix that, and we do, because it's in our interest, because the building will deteriorate very quickly if it's got water ingress, but a lot of it comes from the way people live in their houses. We give our tenants advice on how they can keep the humidity down inside the building. We do a lot of work on mould. We don't want to have to move somebody out of the house to do mould remediation, so we do a lot of work to get in early where we can. We do use professional advice around what is the level of mould and what should we do about it.

**Ms BROWN** - When it comes to asbestos, do you have the same protocol?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Asbestos is different to mould because it's inert unless disturbed. We know how many of our properties have asbestos. Last year we did 109 properties that had asbestos-related maintenance and testing. We will actively go - and if we are going to do some work on a property, our maintenance people are aware of where asbestos is likely to be and we will test for that, and then once we identify asbestos then we are bound to comply

## PUBLIC

with workplace health and safety and all of those things in the way we deal with maintenance. When you have asbestos in a house and it's not damaged or disturbed in any way, we won't go and take that out. Every older house in Tasmania will have asbestos in it somewhere.

**Ms BROWN** - If the area is disturbed, you would go and intervene?

**CHAIR** - Ms Brown, you've had your questions.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Minister, an overarching question. In the past 18 months, have you as an individual been subject of or party to any Supreme Court matters?

**Mr JAENSCH** - Again, Chair, I will raise the same issue I had last time.

**Mr BAYLEY** - This has been answered by the Premier, by Minister Ogilvie -

**Mr JAENSCH** - This is asking a-

**Mr VINCENT** - Here's the answer to that one: no.

**Mr BAYLEY** - In the past 18 months have you as an individual incurred any legal costs that have been covered by taxpayer dollars?

**Mr JAENSCH** - How is this relevant to the budget?

**Mr VINCENT** - I can honestly say I avoid lawyers.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Excellent, thank you, minister. As part of the Homes Tasmania review and the response to the review, your government committed that the responsibility for strategic housing policy would be returned to government under the Department of State Growth. Has this transition been completed?

**Mr VINCENT** - Not fully, but it's in transition at the moment. Craig?

**Mr LIMKIN** - The government has set the strategic intent that the policy will move back, and the functions will move back to government. The steering committee is currently considering papers on what does that mean; we've got to remember that this could impact - and depending on which options we go - will impact some of the employees through Homes Tasmania, so we do need to make sure that this is managed in an appropriate - it's a change-management process. We are continuing to consider those papers, the steering committee that I lead in relation to this meets monthly, and our intention is to have all the recommendations or options before government for consideration in next year's budget, if they need to be - machinery-of-government changes, all those types of matters. I'm not committing to anything at this -

**Mr BAYLEY** - All the recommendations of the review? Or the responses?

**Mr LIMKIN** - Responses, yes. I'm not committing that there will be machinery-of-government changes, I want to be clear, but anything that has to be done to enable the Crawford Review to be implemented, our goal is to have the government make those considerations as part of the 26-27 budget process.

## PUBLIC

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Minister, Huntingfield was your flagship, or Homes Tasmania's flagship, to not only build new homes and get Tasmanians into social affordable housing, but it was also opportunity to raise a fair bit of capital to fund future activity of Homes Tasmania and social housing. What was the original intended capital return for the Huntingfield subdivision, and what is the current projected capital return for the site?

**Mr VINCENT** - Thank you. I haven't got those answers in front of me, but I will just pass to Eleri.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - I have the cost of developing and the average price, but off the top of my head, I don't have that data here. \$35 million? It's about \$35 million.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Is that the answer to the first question or the last question?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - The \$35 million is the profit.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - That was the projected?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Yes, that's our projection at the moment.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - That's your projection at the moment? What was the original intended return on investment?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - I would have to take that on notice.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Can you?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - We have had Huntingfield for over 50 years.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Yes, but you were fast-tracked for development in 2018, so at that stage you would have made an assessment, or the department prior to the creation of Homes Tasmania would have made an assessment of what the capital return was at that time. That's five years ago, but I'm happy to take the five-year ago mark, if that's what you can get me. You would've had a budget for that.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - In 2018 I wasn't here and yes, you are right, we were still in government. I will go back and find those data points for you, if we have them.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - You can take that on notice?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Yes, I will.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Are you happy to take that on notice, minister? I think you have to ask the minister.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Sorry.

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes.

## PUBLIC

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Minister, the housing dashboard reports the number of households seeking social housing, but not the number of individuals within those households, nor does it show a breakdown of the regional need. Having this data is really important for a number of reasons, through public accountability, but also to allow housing and homelessness organisations to be able to make strategic plans, in terms of the effectiveness.

As of September 2025, there were 5336 applicants on the Tasmanian Housing Register with an average waiting time of over 100 weeks for priority housing. Can you provide the committee with details regarding how many families with one child, how many families with two children, how many families with three children, how many families with four or more children, and also, a regional breakdown between north, north-west and south. Will you commit to providing that data ongoing on the housing dashboard, in line with the review recommendations?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, I will pass to Craig in a moment, but before I do, in the two-and-a-half months I've been in the ministry, I've found the dashboard quite difficult to understand, and some of the questions that have come through my meetings from the community groups have been along very similar lines to that question. We are doing a fair bit of work behind the scenes to understand that more as an office, and more of a breakdown of the figures into exactly those questions you asked then, to bedrooms, children and various families' situations. I'm sure Craig, when I hand over to him, will explain a little bit more about the changes we're wanting to bring about understanding with the growth in numbers to that 5300 mark, and on some of the things that we need to understand about the changing demographics of that number as well. I will just pass to Craig for a bit more definition of what I've just started.

**Mr LIMKIN** - Thank you, and I will probably go to Ms Morgan-Thomas to talk about some of the data you've asked for. On recommendation 9, which you talked about, is it that the Homes Tasmania dashboard needs to be updated to really look at further population cohorts seeking and receiving assistance. Our aim as a department, in partnership with Homes Tas, is to be able to provide advice to the minister in early 2026 - and when I say early 2026, my goal is Q1 - to further enhance the dashboard and those type of things.

As part of this process, we need to have a conversation with the community, we need to have a conversation with the community housing sector, we need to seek views from members of parliament, and we're currently in the process of designing that. This dashboard actually has to be useful for people who use it. It's a transparency measure and it's an accountability measure, and it's a communication mechanism, because the community actually needs to understand the challenges and the prioritisation and that. And so, that's currently what we're doing in relation to those enhancement to that dashboard.

As I said, my goal is for the department to provide some advice and the steering committee to sign off by Q1 in 2026. In relation to your specific questions on metrics -

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - I can tell you point-in-time data, because households change over time. You know, people come in and out. That's why we count applicants, because we know how many of them there are.

## PUBLIC

We do know from our records that there are 688 applicants with one child, 446 with two children; 224 with three children; four or more children there are 128, and applicants with no children are 3850. So, 72 per cent of the housing register are single people.

You asked about bedroom eligibility by region. In the north, there are 1332 applicants; 762 of those are seeking one-bedroom; 352 are seeking two-bedroom; 160 are seeking three-bedroom; and 58 are seeking four or more bedrooms.

In the north-west, there are 1517 applicants; seeking one-bedroom 905; two-bedroom 373; three-bedroom 176; and four or more bedrooms 63.

In the south, there are 2487 applicants; one-bedroom there's 1463; two-bedroom 568; three bedrooms 316; and four-plus bedrooms 140.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Minister, I understand that at the recent Housing Industry Association awards, that several properties built or funded by Homes Tas were recipients of awards. Can you give the committee some information about those builds that were awarded?

**Mr VINCENT** - I certainly can. It was nice to go along to the awards and it was even better to see three awards won by Homes Tas people or builders. It was an interesting fact that not like 20 or 30 years ago, there's no cookie-cutter approach to the housing estates now, which is significant because it gives everybody a bit of pride in their homes.

These awards showcase the best in architecture and construction in Tasmania. I was pleased that three of the award winners were projects with financed assistance from Homes Tas. One category was for Affordable Housing Award to incorporate cost-efficient design and deliver high-quality housing. The winner of this category was St Joseph Affordable Homes, a building and construction social enterprise. They provide employment opportunities for young people who have barriers to employment, giving them pathways to trade apprenticeships, which is good.

The other two categories were for: Best Apartment Complex, won by Lyden Builders for an 18-unit build at Chigwell, and Specialised Housing Award, won by Ronald Young & Co for housing tailored for specific needs they built in Rokeby.

These three projects were supported by \$6.76 million of Homes Tas funding, and in some instances, were built on land that was actually owned by Homes Tas. It spoke very strongly with the conversations in the room about the partnerships.

I might say, they did add an award there that was quite interesting - the Site Dog Award of the Year, too.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Fantastic, and congratulations to everybody involved.

**Ms BROWN** - Minister, given you know where the homes are that have asbestos in them, what direction have you given Homes Tas to review them and how often are you reviewing those homes to make sure there isn't any structural damage?

**Mr VINCENT** - I personally, as minister, don't get involved in that side of operations, but we have discussed that there is a proper process in place for Homes Tas of a specialised

## PUBLIC

contractor. Should there be any disturbance or any suspicion that asbestos, there is a number of homes with that, but a specialised contractor will go and review and report to Homes Tas about that. The same with a few other issues as well that come up with some of the legacy homes that we have.

**Ms BROWN** - That's great to know. How quickly would you believe somebody would be reviewing these properties once there has been notification?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'd say that's well beyond my experience with asbestos, but as an old chippy, I do know and follow on from the comments made earlier that as long as they're not disturbed and it's in solid form, it's not a problem. If alterations were happening, the contractors are very serious in this area because of the decades of problems with asbestos, and my personal experience with operations over the years has been that they react very, very quickly to anything that is an issue with asbestos.

**Ms BROWN** - I have a constituent in my electorate who has made complaint of disturbed asbestos to the housing provider, and they were told that the person isn't available right now and would have to wait for that person to return. Do you believe that's appropriate?

**Mr VINCENT** - Under the different circumstances, I can only speculate and I don't want to do that, but I would certainly ask the CEO to have anything to add or you're aware of a situation like that?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Thanks, Minister. I'm not aware of that situation and I would be surprised about that, but -

**Ms BROWN** - I do have it documented. That I can provide to you.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Thank you. We will follow up.

**CHAIR** - We don't usually provide things that the committee. So are you happy to do?

**Ms BROWN** - I will take it out of here.

**Mr VINCENT** - Yeah, we're more than happy to follow up on that with the information because the last thing we want is a situation that's causing anybody any distress.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Notwithstanding the secretary's answer around the responses to the Homes Tas review being implemented by the budget next year. One of the very strong commitments was around a new ministerial statement of expectations for Homes Tas. The commitment was no later than 30 September 2025 to reflect the proposed amendments. Is that something that's going to be, I guess, postponed until budget or is it, has it been published? Have I missed something?

**Mr VINCENT** - I will just hand to the secretary, but I think it's finalised now we've all signed off. I didn't sign off on the draft which has gone to Homes Tas for the board and to sign off on, so it's in the process.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Then it comes back, so you missed the deadline, but you expect that to happen by the end of the year or is that something that the new deadline is the budget?

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - This got held up for a little bit with the election holding things up, but we're just waiting on board to come back to us and we believe that will be before the end of the year.

**Mr BAYLEY** - I guess that begs the question then, are there any other of the commitments made that'll be delivered ahead of the budget? I hear the secretary - This is a genuine question about what we can expect by the end of the year. For example, the Department of State Growth was completing the review of Homes Tas funding and that was envisaged to be delivered by the end of the year 2025 as well. I guess the question is of those responses to the recommendations, can we expect any this year? What should we be looking out for?

**Mr LIMKIN** - There has been a number of completed activities. Recommendation 13, which was ensure the Homes Tasmania board is comprehensively really briefed on the risk associated with the findings of the commission inquiry into children in institutional care, has been completed; finalise the building panels as soon as possible, has also been completed. In relation to your specific question regarding a planned review of the finances of Homes Tas, that has commenced. The department has contracted KPMG to do that work. My expectation is that we will receive a draft report end of the year. We may get a draft report into January just depending on how it flows on Christmas period. There has been a slight delay to that, given the procurement processes, we don't - under the caretaker conventions, we don't push procurements out and I made the call to hold that. Following the re-elected government, we recommenced that. The finance review is a really important one because it will not only look at the future requirements of the funding, it will also need to give advice and options to government on the types of models, because obviously how you deliver homes or what mix of housing you deliver will actually drive what the debt and funding requirements of Homes Tasmania is.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Are you able to table the terms of reference of that review?

**Mr VINCENT** - Happy to take it on notice and provide that.

**Mr Di FALCO** - Minister, how many Tasmanians on the priority list are families with young children, older Tasmanians or people escaping violence, and how is this Budget strengthening support for them?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'm handing over to Ms Morgan Thomas, there is a fair bit of detail on that and certainly we make sure that I have noticed that we cover all age brackets from youth through the people over 55. I'll just ask for a bit more definition from the CEO.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Thank you, minister. As of 31 December, we had:

- 37.8 per cent of the people on the housing register were receiving a disability pension, so disability pensions cover both physical disabilities and psychosocial disability so not everybody in that category needs a modified property, or they could have been on the NDIS.
- 57 per cent are females
- 16 per cent Aboriginal
- 21.6 per cent are aged 16-24
- 12.6 per cent are aged 65 or older
- 1.4 per cent are youth at risk
- 2.5 per cent are exiting prison

## PUBLIC

- 16 per cent with a family violence experience, not necessarily recent, they say, that's what they tell us.

**Mr VINCENT** - Chair, I might just add to that. As you can see from a couple of the questions asked on numbers involved in making up the dashboard, it's fairly obvious to me as an incoming minister that we need to do a fair bit of work to simplify that so that it's much easier for anyone to have a look through that and understand some of those break-ups. It's also important to the ministry to be able to flex some of the finances between years on the growing numbers or the declining numbers in some of those areas and to understand it because most people in this day and age don't understand a lot of the break-up in that. Unless you're directly involved, it's - I must say it's been an eye-opener going and visiting a lot of the sites and the fantastic work that so many people are doing in some of the specialised crisis accommodation areas and youth to independence and things like that.

You understand the complexity more when you go and visit all these people and talk firsthand to them and this is one of the main reasons that we're working to make the dashboard a lot more visible, so we can understand those things a lot more, and so there's total transparency on those numbers so that we can actually put money in the right spots at the right time and understand what's happening in that sector that's under a lot of pressure.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Minister, back to Huntingfield. How much money has the government spent to get Huntingfield to this stage where you're preparing to potentially sell a block?

**Mr VINCENT** - Good looking subdivision -

**Ms O'BYRNE** - Sure it looks good.

**Mr VINCENT** - beautiful views.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - It all looks good yes. When you start building you might have to get Civil Works again.

**Mr VINCENT** - I'll just ask the CEO for that figure on the top.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Thank you, minister. I note that we have had Huntingfield for over 50 years and there is one development that, a part of it, has been subdivided already, but of the recent work we have spent to date \$72.5 million.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - \$72.5 million?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Yes. Sorry, that is what we're projecting because that's over three stages and we haven't commenced some of the works.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - I understand the 50-year bit, but we all know that the land was fast-tracked in - well, commenced in 2018, and it was a defined area that we're talking about. I'm not talking about the stuff that has already been done. So, you're projecting 70 - sorry, run that by me again.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - By the time stage 3 is completed, all lots are on the market or they're ready for us to build on, it will be \$72.5 million based on our current budget.

## PUBLIC

**Mr O'BYRNE** - How much of that is civil works?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Most of that is civil works because the bits that you need to do for statutory planning and all of those things are time-consuming, but not necessarily expensive items, other than people's time. Civil works is obviously the big thing. You have to build roads, gutters - we have to put in water and sewerage; there's water that needs to be taken off the site. There's a natural watercourse flowing through it and, if you've been past it, you would have seen there was a lot of cut and fill and things

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Yes, I've seen it regularly.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - From the roundabout and the slip lane that was there, our contractor was able to reuse some of that material. We weren't taking it off site. We were being efficient and environmentally responsible by looking at how we used both of those together. That's gone into the landscaping on the site.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Has all the civil work been completed?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - No. We do those things in stages. When you are developing a big block of land like that one - there are 468 housing lots on it - what you don't want to do is complete them all at once because then you have to rate pay rates individually. That stacks up. You don't want to do that. You want to release them to the market as they come on. If they take a long time to sell, the first lot, then you would delay subsequent works rather than have it all sitting there. At the moment, assuming things all go well, which is how we're budgeted for, at the moment, we believe it will be about \$72.5 million.

**Mr VINCENT** - Sorry, we do have an answer to Mr Bayley's question if the Secretary wants to read that into *Hansard*.

**Mr LIMKIN** - Through you, minister. In relation to the question on the review, the terms of reference are to look at:

- Homes Tasmania's current housing delivery model and whether it aligns with the government policies and priorities and the available funding.
- the performance of Homes Tasmania's delivery model compared to available industry benchmarks and CHPs providers for similar builds.
- the identification by Homes Tasmania of alternative approaches or innovations to maximise housing supply including, for example, through partnerships with community housing providers; private investors, such as super funds, build-to-rent specialists, et cetera; the Australian government and the building industry.

The review should have particular consideration to whether Homes Tasmania's cash and borrowing requirements and the associated impact on the state budget, now and beyond 2032; options to ensure Homes Tasmania can deliver on its objectives with the available resources, including opportunities for generating additional revenue and/or further cost reductions - for example, the maximisation of Tasmania's participation in Australian Government initiatives - and options analysis of the expectation costs of Homes Tas delivering more social and affordable homes over the next decade with an emphasis on the asset mix and the value for

money. This will include the Homes Tasmania's board's recent decisions in relation to CHPs. For clarity, as well, the original review that was recommended by Ms Margaret Crawford was both a financial and procurement review. We had them split, so we could move at a further pace. We wanted to have the financial review completed quickly and the procurement review will follow, and the procurement review is really about the application of the Treasurer's Instructions to Homes Tasmania and the *Financial Management Act*, not to say we're removing accountability mechanisms, but we want them to be nimble and quick. That was the purpose of setting up Homes Tasmania, so that review will follow separately after this piece of work. My understanding is that it'll all still be done in time for the budget and consideration next year.

**Mr BAYLEY** - So the terms of reference have not been written for that one yet - the structure and procurement?

**Mr LIMKIN** - There are draft terms of reference and if you give me two minutes -

**Mr BAYLEY** - We're comfortable with them just being tabled, if that's easier.

**Mr LIMKIN** - We don't have anyone upstairs for a printer at the moment, that's why I want to give the committee the information now.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Thank you.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Minister, modular and manufactured housing is more and more commonplace now. What role does it play in our social and affordable housing stock in Tasmania?

**Mr VINCENT** - Modular homes are the changing face of homes and a pretty serious thing within Homes Tasmania as a thought pattern for the future. A lot of that comes from the fact that 53 per cent, I believe it is, of people require a single or two-bedroom unit. The beauty from what I've seen as I've travelled around quite a few of the manufacturers of modular homes is that they can be being built while a DA is going through and then be very quickly moved to site.

Quite a few of the operations around the state are still in their infancy of developing the production lines set up of being able to build those facilities. They have a couple of different design modules used, and you can use them for a single or two-bedroom place but you can also use them for three- and four-bedroom places and just put several of them together, so it is something that will become more and more definite to keep the costs down of all home constructions.

They are very well built, they're very strong, and they're designed to be removed if they have to be. It was very interesting in Devonport at the Youth2Independence program, the young people were very quick to tell us you can hear the person running around next door, so the floors need to be quieter, and they need a clothesline for each person because they don't like putting their clothes out on the communal clothesline. It's marvellous what you pick up when you move around with some of the young people. The modular homes are very adaptable at either being conjoined or separate.

The other thing we need to do with modular homes is look at a few of the planning issues associated around them. Some people try to drive as many as they can onto a block. We had a

recent development that was for 12 on a block of land and the council thought it was too many but when you brought it back to 10 it was sensible, so the developer was able to redo the numbers on 10 instead of 12 to make it work. There are issues like having the appropriate amount of parking for modular homes and also the fact that they can cater for a lot of different scenarios, but the organisation running that, if it's through a community group, needs to understand the balance of people who are going into those areas living so close to one another. They do that very well and the communication and the development, whether it's young mums or senior people or young people, is quite amazing. The potential of modular homes becoming an increasing part of our landscape is something this old chippy's had to get used to very quickly over the last couple months. The development in them is amazing and when you walk into them you wouldn't know - they are just fantastically well built.

**Ms BROWN** - Minister, the Housing Connect reform project commenced in 2019 and was to go live by 30 June 2024. It's now 2025. Can you please outline the reasons for the delays?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, I'll ask the CEO to give a more accurate definition to it, but the holdup was something I've discussed with Anglicare a fair bit in recent weeks. It's been around some of the IT that's there and clarification that the testing stage is right before we go live.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Minister, the Housing Connect reform had two parts. The first part is redesigning the service system that's delivered by NGOs and in part by Homes Tasmania about who did what and the way in which we work, so it's all about moving towards advantage thinking. We were advised by the Brotherhood of St Laurence in what the service design would be. We got partway through that and realised that the system that collects homelessness data that's provided by the Commonwealth through the Institute of Health and Welfare, which we're all required to report to nationally, wasn't going to work for us. We couldn't see what was in it with the Tasmanian data, we weren't able to extract it and it wasn't going to provide the support for the service model, so we undertook to build from scratch the system that we needed to support the Housing Connect system.

One of the things that's unique about Tasmania and what I really love is that we have a really integrated housing and homelessness system in a way that is not replicated in any other state, so if there was something we could have picked up off the shelf and used, or we could have made SHIP, the one that we had to use for reporting, we would have, but we went down the track of building a system that integrates into our housing management system and as we got to the bit where we're testing the data extraction from SHIP into our system, we discovered that the migration wasn't working and we were getting complete gobbledygook. That would have meant we could have gone without the data migration, but clients would have had to come in and tell their stories all over again, and we know that's the thing clients hate most of all; they want to have consistency around that.

The new system, when it comes, will provide a warm [?? 5:58:19] referral if they need a referral, so it's clear that the client's information is going with it. Different people, if they're getting support from say Centacare after initially talking to Anglicare, all of that client history will be able to be seen there and then will eventually come into the Housing Register if that's a thing for them.

We got to the point last year where we were doing the integration and that wasn't working, so we had to go back and work with the provider of SHIP to work that through. When we were

testing it with frontline workers they were saying this bit doesn't work. I mean, you always get that when you're implementing an IT system - 'This doesn't work and this doesn't work. We would prefer you to fix that rather than go live with something that doesn't work.'. We heard that and we work very closely with Anglicare who deliver the front door of Housing Connect so that they're informed about what we're doing, and the strong advice from them was don't go out with something that isn't tested.

We've now sorted out the data migration. We have a really strong plan now to go live, which still has to be approved by the Homes Tasmania board, but we're expecting it next year and we're keeping the sector engaged with that. We will make sure in order to make that work that we have quite a long training period, because it's very hard to release frontline workers to go and do training. That's a thing that's obviously a stress for them. We know from the first attempt when we were trying to do that that we need to work that a bit longer, so we've been working with the sector around that.

**Mr VINCENT** - One of the things that was quite fascinating that Anglicare have coached me on a fair bit is that it's alright to collect the data to deal with a crisis situation, but it's also important to gather a lot of the other information to be able to direct or assist some of those recipients of need to a finer point where we've got an outcome a lot quicker. The housing is so important but it has the ability, when we get this right, to be able to do so much more and collect a lot of data that will help us come up with far better outcomes than just the housing and also assist us in the solutions for a lot of the people going through that system.

**Ms BROWN** - Can you provide detail on the cost of the delay over the original estimated spend?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Yes, I can. It will cost \$2.4 million more than we originally thought and we're expecting that the total five-year project budget will be about \$5.5 million.

**Ms BROWN** - You said that the portal will go live next year. Do you have an estimated timeframe?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - It'll be in the first half of next year. It's a portal that clients will be able to use and it's also a platform that workers can use. It's got two parts to it.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Minister, the Budget is really clear in highlighting a range of risks with government priorities being delivered through public non-financial corporations, such as Homes Tasmania. I note that Homes Tas' debt goes up from \$500 million thereabouts now, to \$1 billion at the end of the forward Estimates. That's \$25 million to service it, and now up to \$50 million in 2029. A couple of questions - what's that being used for? Is that purely being used to build homes and do activities or also paying for staff? What's the strategy for paying it back? Can you guarantee that social homes won't be sold off to repay that debt, with the exception of affordable homes to existing tenants and a few small caveats like that, which are well understood?

**Mr VINCENT** - Certainly. Debt servicing is provided to Homes Tasmania through the Tasmanian budget and is clearly identified in the Homes Tasmania' chapter. Homes Tasmania is responsible for servicing the debt through the debt service provided in the Budget, the current debt is secured by Treasury guarantee. The debt servicing costs associated with supporting the additional borrowings excessed in 2028-29 to \$221 million, and it is used for capital in those

places. I will ask the CEO for a little bit more clarification, but it is used for social and affordable housing.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Yes, I can confirm that the Homes Tasmania's board has decided we will only use debt for capital and that covers social and affordable housing, it also covers our equity share in MyHome, and we use that to pay for development costs of land that we will be developing for sale or retention. It goes to all of those that are capital things, not recurrent expenditure.

As Mr Limkin said earlier, there is a financial review which will be looking at all of those things. The work that we have done so far, is we know that from land sales that we expect to make a profit from that and the capital that we get from that is returned into the capital budget, and we will use that capital ahead of debt. When MyHome co-purchasers decide to either buy us out, or refinance or something like that, our share is returned to us - that also comes into the capital budget and is allocated for capital purposes. We've been modelling what that looks like, and because MyHome has a really long tail and so does land development, we will still be developing land when we've reached the 10,000, so that will keep coming in. At the moment, we're looking at when could you retire the debt using those funds? But all of that will be subject to what comes out of financial -

**Mr BAYLEY** - The Budget adequately provides for you to service the debt that you've incurred?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - The way debt comes at the moment, we can only borrow as much as the amount that is provided to us by the government for debt-servicing. We have a debt limit; it's a self-limiting thing. We have a debt limit that is approved by the cap, which is approved by the Treasurer and then we go to TASCORP and say, 'Please can we have some debt?' and they go 'We need to see the Treasurer's guarantee in writing,' so we go back to the Treasurer and get a guarantee and then we ask for the drawdown.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Minister, the government's response to the quarter review said:

In developing strategic housing policy, the department should advise the minister on the best mix of housing types to comprise the 10,000 target, including the mixed of inbuilt and greenfield development.

The minister, the department and Home Tasmania should clearly indicate the government's housing preferences to sectors engaged in housing development.

Now, this would be examined as part of the financial review we were talking about beforehand, which is also addressing recommendations 1 and 2.

I appreciate the financial review hasn't been done and I understand completely being quarter one, for next year - but have you been given that advice in relation to the mix of housing? We've heard this from the data provided beforehand, the different kinds of homes we need and the locations around that, have you been given that data and has that review been done on the strategy of the mix of housing types we need?

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - Only in relation to the data that we have available, and we've tabled so far today, and other points that are open to everybody. The secretary and I had several conversations over recent weeks about - in my words recalibrating some of that data - so we understand it clearer and having it more direct and more defined. The 10,000 is a target, but as we know, it continues on, so we need to understand the urgent requirement.

I spoke before about one- and two-bedroom dwellings and the sort of information that that may change what we need to put in to discuss with Homes Tas about the annual plan and concentration of where the monies need to go. I will just ask the secretary for any clarification other than that.

**Mr LIMKIN** - Just briefly, minister - Ms Johnston, that will be done as part of the review

-

**Ms JOHNSTON** - It hasn't been done yet?

**Mr LIMKIN** - It hasn't been done yet. We haven't provided advice. What I'm concerned about is - what I don't want to do is go, 'Here's the advice on your mix,' and then 'here's the financial advice,' and the government's making choices on their mix and financial separately. We've tried to package the two together, so the government has all available options that can be considered on the matter that you've spoken and then also the budget impacts and the forward Estimates' impact on that.

The review is specifically designed to take us beyond 2032, because, as we know, housing is a right, and there is a long guide path. It's not a simple fact, and so we need to work through it in a methodical way over the time.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Have you done any analysis on the current stock, in terms of the mix of your current stock that you have at the moment?

**Mr LIMKIN** - That advice is coming from Homes Tas into KPMG, and if there are any gaps in that, KPMG will work through to do that. My expectation is there should be a section in the report that really demonstrate what the current state of our housing system is in stock, and then be able to build on that, and the choices available to government are based off that information.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - And that will be made available publicly?

**Mr LIMKIN** - One of the things we will have to balance is - this review will provide options available for government to make decisions as part of a budget process. Our intention is to make sure that there is information able to be made publicly as part of that, as part of the outcome.

I don't want to commit to what is actually made publicly today, because we just need to work through that will protect Cabinet in confidence, but there is a definitive goal to actually put some public information out at the completion of the review, just depending on what that is.

**Mr VINCENT** - You can see from some of the questions that, as I said before, that the amount of rework we'd need to do to make sure that going outside of this interim Budget, which

## PUBLIC

kept things going for Homes Tas and the providers, the importance of getting those numbers right so we can prepare budgets in the future that are going to reflect exactly what we need.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Minister, just continuing my line of questioning: just so I've got this right, let's look at the numbers. You've forecast you will spend \$72.5 million getting Huntingfield to the developed stage, but you're going to make \$35 million out of that. Is that meaning that you're going to earn \$107.5 million in land sales? Is that how it works? Have I added it up correctly? Two simple numbers.

**Mr VINCENT** - The \$72.5 million included stages 1, 2 and 3, where you were defining the last couple of years, I think.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Well, since 2018. And so, I'm assuming that you're forecasting \$107 million in sales to come back to earn the \$35 million profit. Is that right?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'm getting a very important nod down there.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Right. So, given Homes Tas' track record - excuse my scepticism - about some of the numbers, but what has been the actual spend to date? I can understand your projected, but that is, you know, a guess. What have you actually spent to date?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - I'm sorry, I don't have that number to hand, but I can take that on notice.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - You don't have it on hand? Huntingfield's been a big issue in the parliament and in the community debate. You didn't expect that question? How could you not have that detail?

**Mr VINCENT** - I've just got here, in the break up, of stage 1 being \$43.8 million, stage 2 \$9.5, and stage 3 \$19.2, which make up the total of \$72.5.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Which of that is projected at actual?

**Mr VINCENT** - I will just ask the CEO what stage they're exactly at the moment.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Stage 1, we're fairly confident about. The reason I can't actually answer it right now is that some of those contracts are in train, and we haven't - I think one of those civil works contracts is not quite -

**Mr O'BYRNE** - But my question is what you spent to date?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Stage 1, by the time it is completed will be \$43.8 million.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Essentially, what you're saying is it's about \$44 million so far for Stage 1, but the next two sections will be around \$27 million to \$28 million?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Yes.

## PUBLIC

**Mr O'BYRNE** - I'm sorry that I'm asking a lot of questions, Chair. I don't mean to take up time. Why is the first stage more expensive? Is that because that has the TasWater and utilities?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - It's some of that. It's also the biggest stage. It has 218 lots in it, total, and it has some complicated sewerage and waterworks in it and also that waterway that I talked about and some site remediation works. As I think you're aware, there was both an environmental protection biodiversity -

**Mr O'BYRNE** - EPBC referral, yes.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Yes, because of the 40-spotted pardalotes flyover and we also had to do some protection of Aboriginal artefacts. We are doing a large piece of landscaping which is down around the watercourse and down around the Peter Murrell Reserve and the boundaries there and that work is all captured in the first lot, so it is more expensive.

**CHAIR** - We'll go to Mr Jaensch now.

**Mr JAENSCH** - I see that the Budget includes funding for the new Bethlehem House over the forward Estimates. Could you give us an outline of what those funds are going to be used for as part of that service?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, I can, having gone out there to see how it operates. It's quite amazing and I touched on Anglicare wanting the Housing Connect portal to reflect things that they can do to have outcomes, and the beauty of Bethlehem House is that the \$705,000 a year will allow them to work with the 74 men that they have there as well as doing some work at Amelie House. I was fascinated by the fact that even have the kennels there for the dogs, so the men don't have to be separated from their best friend.

The thing I liked about how they use their money there, it wasn't just for a bed and meals, it was also underneath they had a fantastic - I dream about having - carpentry workshop there where they all learnt various skills. Up just off the kitchen/dining room area they had a room with computers and even the piano that had been donated for those that had musical interests. But they also do a lot of training there for people to integrate back into the community. They have approximately 16 per cent of the people that go through there end up with jobs and about 64 per cent end up with stable accommodation once they've been there and have their confidence back.

Some of the men there that I talked to had trouble being individuals out in the community and felt like they earned their place there by doing a lot of outreach work as well to some of the people that had moved on. Part of that money is also for prisoners coming out that don't have anywhere to go for a few nights until they re-establish themselves out. They do a lot of work with that, and it was the outcomes and the follow-through of the whole process that impressed me about how the money was being used that we put into there. It's fantastically well spent.

**Ms BROWN** - Minister, your government has failed to deliver on your 2024 promise to increase the rapid rehousing program properties to 150 houses. The program has stalled with only 43 houses in the program. What have you done in your capacity to increase the number of properties in this program?

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, we have some expenditure there. I spoke with Anglicare also about the greater need in that area and, I'm just getting my notes here, I will read this to get this right for you. The expanded affordable private rental programs are funded for a total of 550 properties. Properties are allocated to either private rental incentive or the family violence rapid housing applicants based on need at the time.

When the expanded programs commenced, some existing owners in the Family Violence Rapid Rehousing program were unable to commit to another term, mostly because they needed to sell their properties or move back in. Homes Tasmania expects the number of properties in the program to begin increasing as properties become available over the coming months. There are nearly 200 active inquiries from property owners. Where it was slow to start and some people were nervous about the time of the contracts, that has been overcome with a greater amount of people now wishing to be part of that program. As it says here, 200 active inquiries from property owners wishing to be part of that, to have their properties involved with that program. I expect to see an increase in the amount of people being able to be placed into those homes.

**Ms BROWN** - In your current capacity you haven't done anything further to increase it quicker?

**Mr VINCENT** - Myself personally, I have discussed it with Anglicare about how we can move people into those homes quicker, but with private homes we do have to go through a process to make sure that the leases are there for those to move into.

**Ms BROWN** - How long is that process from the inquiry to having somebody moved in?

**Mr VINCENT** - I would need to ask the CEO for clarification on that, please.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Thanks, minister. Well, it depends on the property owner. We're very low vacancy rates, so property has to become vacant in order to be offered to the program. We do this through Loreto Community Housing, they're our partner here. They will negotiate with the owner. They'll also go and do a check - does it actually meet the basic requirements of the *Residential Tenancy Act* - and do some compliance tests and things. A small number of those won't make it through that process, because we've got a duty of care to people, we make sure that all of that's there

It's a fairly quick process once you have that lined up and you've found the property. The hard thing at the moment is finding landlords who have a vacancy - it's a very low vacancy market - who want to participate in the program, but we had eight new sign-ups in August and seven in September, so it's coming. With Loreto, we're continuing to advertise the program. I keep seeing it on Facebook, so you might as well if you've got housing in the things that you're interested in. It is working in that sort of social media, word of mouth approach.

**Mr VINCENT** - Discussions I've had over the last couple of weeks indicate that we need to locate some more homes in the north-west coast area. That stood out loud and clear to me as well, so we will be doing more work on that.

## PUBLIC

**Ms BROWN** - So that's a commitment of yours that you will be doing more work to make sure that women and children escaping family violence on the north-west coast - you will actively do more work in that space?

**Mr VINCENT** - Anglicare were quite clear on that with us and have come forward with some suggestions on how we might do that and we're looking at those at the moment.

**Ms BROWN** - What suggestions are they?

**Mr VINCENT** - I won't go into it now because it's private rentals, but Anglicare had several thoughts on how we could be more active in that area with some of the people that have success in other areas of the state moving into that area to be able to facilitate more homes.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Minister, are you able to outline for the committee or perhaps it might be something you need to take on notice, what applications Homes Tasmania has made for federal funding over the last 12 months, and for what projects and which ones have been successful and which ones haven't?

**Mr VINCENT** - It's been quite awkward for Homes Tasmania with some of the federal funding issues, but I have had discussions with several of the providers that Homes Tasmania works with and I will ask the CEO to clarify that there has been a steady flow of some of the HSAP money to Tasmania.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Thanks, minister. There are a lot of commonwealth funds, and they've all got very similar names, so bear with me. There's been two rounds of the Housing Australia Future Fund. In Round 2, which was open to state housing authorities only, we exceeded our quota. I think we should have got about 100 but we actually got 144 Housing Australia Future Fund dwellings. We're in the process of negotiating all those and getting all that lined up. We have to build them before the funding happens. They're all in train. The Social Housing Accelerator, which was a few years ago, the first of those properties were delivered on Flinders Island a couple of months ago. They were some of the first in the country, so go Flinders Island Aboriginal Association. This is probably the hardest place to build and a high performer.

The rest of those will be progressively coming online as they get built. One of those you might recall is the one that St Vincent de Paul is doing in Argyle Street, that's part of that program. All of these have some Homes Tasmania funding and involvement in it. The Housing Support Program, which is the priority work stream, Tasmania's share of that is \$25 million. We are using that - because some of it is about infrastructure - to unlock land, and that will unlock about 500 lots of land and build 20 homes. We're working on all of those. There's a whole range of little programs in that and big ones.

Tasmania's share of the Crisis and Transitional Accommodation Program is \$2.25 million. There are seven dwellings out of that for women escaping family and domestic violence. We're in the middle of starting the builds on those. There's another program called the National Housing Infrastructure Facility Crisis and Transitional Program which has been extended and is open for applications at the moment. It has an extended period that's open. We are likely to put in for more standalone homes for women escaping domestic and family violence, and we have a priority in the north-west for those and the other program. There are a couple of other programs that we are talking to them about - State Growth is talking to them

about, that we haven't quite landed at the Commonwealth end at the moment, but we have a lot of interest.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Did you apply for any and miss out; are there many that you've kind of missed out on, for whatever reason?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Not at all in the last year. In fact, we have more than we thought we would get, particularly in HAFF.

**Mr VINCENT** - When you analysed the figures on what the national fund is for each of those five that were just mentioned, we run it in between 2-4 per cent, about 2.5 per cent, which is probably where Tasmania sits again on the national average, from what I've been told.

**Mr BAYLEY** - National average in terms of historical allocation or in terms of need?

**Mr VINCENT** - I would say in terms of need.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - It's population.

**Mr VINCENT** - Population based - the 2.5 per cent, 2-4 per cent. They are federally making sure that we do get at least a decent allocation towards - there is a growing number of private developers who are also asking for Homes Tasmania to support their projects towards more affordable housing as well.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - A recent report by Anglicare Tasmania shows that without change, demand for social housing will grow and continue to grow faster than supply. This would see approximately 14,000 Tasmanians waiting for social housing by 2032. Given the housing strategy currently isn't providing enough social homes for the over 5000 applicants on the waiting list, how does Homes Tasmania or yourself, minister, plan to manage this increasing list?

**Mr VINCENT** - This is part of the reason why the review is needed. Nationally, it's very similar, around a shortage of carpenters, cost of building, lots of different areas that are adding to that issue and that's why I have asked for a fresh look at the numbers so that if we have to scale ourselves differently - and that's going to be an industry thing across all areas because it's not just a matter of building more, or saying you're going to build more places when you haven't got the trades to do it.

Homes Tasmania has quite an impressive record of, I believe, housing supply orders. It's 15 different sites that they've taken on board now which are in the early stages of going through so we feel confident we will have probably the supply of land over the next couple of years to be able to do it, but we have to work with the construction industry to make sure there's enough tradespeople to do it, and understand that balance of homes we need so we're feeding it. I don't believe there's any doubt with the cost of living the way it is that those numbers will continue to have pressure on them, and that's why we need to do our homework a little bit better and recalibrate to make sure that we're doing our best to meet those needs.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - That's 14,000 social housing needs, not 10,000 homes overall; how are you going to increase the amount of social housing provided in your target?

**Mr VINCENT** - Some of that will be by purchasing, but I'd ask either the secretary or the CEO if they'd like to clarify that. It's pretty obvious from the time in the ministry that we do need to look at things differently, because all parts are under pressure, even the supply of goods is making it difficult. The amount of time taken to get approval for homes is something that we need to do in planning to assist Homes Tasmania in bringing the speed of getting a home to build stage, as well as making sure we have enough apprentices coming through to replace a lot of the retiring tradesmen as well. It's going to be an industry thing that is going to have to accelerate, not just a government policy, saying we're going to do 14,000 instead of 10,000 or any other number. It is going to be across the board. CEO, would you like to add to that at all?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Thanks, minister. The Anglicare projection is a straight-line projection, assuming nothing changes. The thing that we know, and this came up earlier in the question around the Private Rental Incentive Scheme and Rapid Rehousing, is when you're relying on a private rental market that is completely collapsing in Tasmania, it's collapsing for a whole lot of reasons that are out of the control of the Tasmanian government or Homes Tasmania. So, the reason for that is partly low capital growth, which is a good thing for other bits of the housing system, but for investors in private rental dwellings, who in Tasmania mostly are mum and dad investors, those people are not investing in housing because of the interaction between Commonwealth housing, taxation settings, and interest rates means that it doesn't stack up for them. They're relying on a system that doesn't work. It's a really inefficient way to deliver a private rental market.

We know that when we look at the people who are coming onto the housing register, a large percentage of those people are there because of unaffordability in the private rental market. I would argue that the answer for a lot of those people is not social housing, because that's state having to then intervening in their lives for the rest of their - it's not a great outcome for a lot of people. I've made my whole working life in social housing. I'm not arguing against it. It is an important thing, but we actually have to look at how we fix the private rental market in Australia and in Tasmania as well, and we can't assume that because people are on the housing register that the answer for that will be social housing because it would make it unsustainable for the state. The Tasmanian government would end up owning all of the properties in Tasmania.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - People do need social housing. That's a reality because the private rental market has failed them.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - It is, but is the answer social housing or is it a different way to approach the private rental market, which would be another way to look at it because social housing is a very deep subsidy. Absolutely we have to look at that, and the financial review is going help us go, what is the long-term cost of all these things? You can build something today, but how are you going to own it for 40 years? Those are important things for all governments to think about, but private rental in Australia is broken.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Back to Huntingfield: Homes Tasmania issued two tenders for civil works in 2024, but neither of them were awarded. Why not?

**Mr VINCENT** - I will ask the CEO to clarify that, that because it is operational.

## PUBLIC

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - We think it was only one that wasn't awarded. We're not aware of the second one.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - You issued two. Neither of them finished up in work; so did you withdraw one?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - We withdrew one and the reason we withdrew it: we were in negotiation with the preferred tenderer and could not reach commercial close, and on the advice of the Crown Solicitor we withdrew the tender.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - That's obviously contributed to another delay, hasn't it?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - We fully expected to be able to reach commercial close with that contractor.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Minister, you mentioned the land supply earlier on. Could you speak to the committee about what is being done to ensure that there is a supply of suitable land for housing?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, I didn't mention it before. It's quite sensible use of what's been recently a couple of ex-military sites at Deloraine and coming on board, but the housing supply order is about -

**Mr JAENSCH** - Excellent piece of legislation just quietly.

**Mr VINCENT** - Really, that's good. Glad you're proud of it. It is about the re-zoning, but that's the very start of it and there are some things that we need to look at to tidy up some of the process there that we've learned recently, but there is also a process of what's on the site now clearing this site contamination, the process of working with council to make sure that the plans are going to be right for those sites.

There's an enormous amount of work. We've got sites at Burnie, Devonport, Beaconsfield, Georgetown and Launceston, and around 85 per cent of the subdivisions are released in the market for homeownership, which gets that 85-15 balance and that makes it affordable for Homes Tas have to work through as well. Fifteen per cent for social housing, 85 per cent for affordable housing.

The bit I keep going back to, the planning with some of these things that if we can streamline that process, it's alright to have to purchase land or transfer it over and then the rest of the process we've got to get to happen quicker. That's why one of the comments made earlier on about the acceleration in 2027 as some of these properties come online with a bit of fine tuning, we can dramatically increase the number of homes on those sites.

The other thing I like about what we're going through at the moment is, we keep talking about one- and two-bedroom units and the size of blocks moving from what we grew up being around 900 to 1000 square metres a block. That's still appropriate if you're going to put six, eight, 10 modular homes on it, but in some cases the square metreage at 450 or even smaller needs to be looked at seriously about to get that balance through there.

## PUBLIC

My own belief is that with Homes Tas having these sites right around Tasmania, they're able to develop the actual subdivision plan and the type of housing on there that fits in with, not the cookie cutter approach that we used to have decades ago, to make them into real little communities that are supporting one another, to take away the angst of having social or affordable housing in those areas.

**CHAIR** - Alright, it's what time is it? It is 6:35 p.m., so a good time just to have a 10-minute break and I know some of the committee will be leaving and there will be a swap.

**Ms BROWN** - Is there any opportunity to finish up some questions. I just have a few more.

**Mr BAYLEY** - I have one more as well.

**CHAIR** - If you want to do that, the committee is of the mind to do that. Yes, because you will swap over, will you?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Yes.

**CHAIR** -Okay, so we will hear from Ms Brown, and then Mr Bayley.

**Ms BROWN** - Minister, I'm glad to hear that the northwest is a focus for you when it comes to the rapid rehousing program, and I look forward to keeping you accountable on that promise. Can you please provide information of how many rapid rehousing applications are on the wait-list?

**Mr VINCENT** - We haven't got that before us, so I'm happy to take that on those and get back to you on that if that's okay.

**Ms BROWN** - Can I also ask for that to be broken down by region?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes.

**Ms BROWN** - Minister, according to the Homes Tas website, perpetrators of family violence are able to access the rapid rehousing program. Do you have a breakdown of how many perpetrators have successfully been housed in the last five years?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - I will have to take that on notice as well.

**Ms BROWN** - By region as well? Excellent, thank you.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Just one last question. I won't use my two, but minister, I can't help but pick up on the CEO's comments there, around the failures in the private housing market. We've got a long list of questions that I won't direct at you because unfortunately, they're for the minister for Consumer Affairs.

It begs the question, things like reining in short-stay accommodation, rent control legislation, minimum standards and ending unfair no-cause evictions - these are all the sort of things that we need to improve to give renters rights and give them the ability to stay in the private rental market, so they don't fall down to Homes Tas and the social housing market.

It begs the question, what do you do as Minister for Housing in that space? There's a bit of an unfortunate skew in the portfolios that you don't have responsibility for some of these really critical housing issues that impact on Homes Tas as we've heard. What conversations are going in and what commitments can you give to this committee about championing some of those reforms, so that we do get a holistic reform of the housing space and start to meet people's needs?

**Mr VINCENT** - There's a lot of different areas there that you've just mentioned, plus a few others that we're looking at that need to be reviewed. Implied tenancies are another one that's proven to be quite awkward, within families or situations where you think you're doing the right thing, but then we find out that place is taken up. There is also an area with the NDIS that we've identified that we don't have a lot of control of now, but we would like to be a little bit more involved with.

A different pot of money - there are a lot of homes sitting vacant around the state at the moment, that we think we could use for a different classification, but there's a lot of work that has to go in behind the scenes. As I hinted at before, there's a lot of one per centres that we have to do to make sure this is right.

It's been a very emotional two-and-a-half months in the role, I can guarantee that. I've taken it all on board and I'm listening to all advice. Nobody has a magic silver bullet for any of this at all, and that's why I've been so open in conversations with everybody here at parliament, as well as everybody involved in the industry, because those one per centres will make the difference on how we deal with some of these issues. I can only give you a guarantee that I will be doing everything I possibly can in this area, and happy to take any suggestions on board because sometimes it's the little things that make a difference.

It can be the confidence we've struck with some of the housing supply orders - a lot of pushback from communities about having a large number of social-affordable housing in the area, which I think is quite unjust with the way social housing is done. That's why I've mentioned about the cookie-cutter, it's just not there anymore. These are architecturally designed homes in many cases, that fit perfectly into existing communities, and we need to do a greater sell on how some of these subdivisions are so well designed, which takes away some of that angst from perhaps the community that are pushing back on timeline. It's a lot of different things that I want to get involved with to try and fix.

**Mr BAYLEY** - I don't think anyone's saying there's a single silver bullet; that's why there are all these levers that need to be pulled. There's plenty of evidence that points to the different levers. At the moment, I guess there's some frustration in the in the community and in this place as well. The government is sort of focusing on a few of them and not all of them. It's clear we need to pull out all stops.

**Mr VINCENT** - I'm very pleased to have the portfolios I have. I've got a fair workload, and everybody's been telling me that I have, and I know I have. My ministry is actually blended into a lot of the parts that need to be looked at and are part of the solution, or part of the things that I can have influence on, whether it's the knowledge and infrastructure or certainly, Mr Reid and I are having a lot of conversations, and I've touched on about some of the planning things that we need to look at to simplify the process. I'm comfortable with having that blend of ministries that should be able to allow me to focus on a lot of the different solutions as well.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - Mr O'Byrne has some questions for -

**Mr O'BYRNE** - A few questions, if you want to continue on Housing for a little bit.

**CHAIR** - Right.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Thank you. Minister, -

**CHAIR** - Committee, what do you want to do? Do you want to have a break now and just tide this over? Or are you happy to finish with Mr O'Byrne's question?

**Mr BAYLEY** - I will offer my thanks and leave. Thank you.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - I'm happy to finish Mr O'Byrne's questions.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - It could go for some time. It's a bit like a Homes Tas promise. Minister, you established the Builder's Panel, which I thought was a very good idea, to try and streamline the tendering processes. Why didn't you use the Builders Panel for Huntingfield?

**Mr VINCENT** - It's a different sort of housing to start with on the first 33 blocks, I believe, but I will check with the CEO for clarification on that.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - To get on the panel it has cost builders tens of thousands of dollars, and then all of a sudden, the first big prize comes up and, 'No, we're not going to use it'. That doesn't add up, does it?

**Mr MORGAN-THOMAS** - There are two builders panels, a class 1 and a class 2 builders panel. Class 2 is multistorey. All of those are actively working on a whole lot of projects that we put out, including some of the Commonwealth ones I talked about. There's a lot of work that we've delivered through the panels.

Huntingfield is a different proposition because we were wanting builders that would come along and build things for sale that were setting the tone for the whole development and if we allocated a number of blocks to those builders, they would bring things back to the good of the whole. We are hoping for things like display homes and things like that, like you would do as a normal developer.

It's a different proposition. Some of the builders are the same as on the builders panel, but in the builders panel we are paying the money. We are the client and they are the provider, so it's a different relationship. What we are doing in Huntingfield is allowing them to market a house to a home purchaser on our land and we're doing that as a package, so it's a different commercial proposition. We're not paying the Huntingfield builders to build the homes. What we are doing is allowing them to participate in our curated development.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Could you just clarify 'setting the tone for a bold development'? What does that mean?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - It's about building on the design code. Some of the lots are small, suitable for terraces. You could use them as terraces, but you could also put tiny homes on them or something. We don't want that. What we want is a row of terraces that looks good

and functions well within the space. It's about having good quality design and use of the space. It is a fantastic site, as you would have seen, with views and all of those things, so it's about how we maximise the value of that and get a return.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - I understand the policy goal, but it was fast-tracked for development in 2018. We're hurtling towards Christmas 2025 and not one house has been built, not one block has been put up for sale and there's been issues with tenders that you've had to withdraw. Surely the goal of Homes Tas is to facilitate the building of homes. I'm not sure what you're trying to describe down in Huntingfield. Surely people need homes and surely builders need blocks to build on. It's as simple as that, isn't it? Have you overcomplicated this to the point where nothing has happened down there?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - I don't believe so. I believe that what we have done is what you would expect of a model developer and a government one where we have had to comply with the EPBC. We haven't been in the media talking about that, but in regard to dealing with the Commonwealth approvals process around the environmental stuff, we only got that recently.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - In 2022, wasn't it?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - No, since March this year. We've still been to-ing and fro-ing because they incorporated some of the Aboriginal heritage issues into it and they asked us to do something we actually couldn't do. We've had to deal with all of that and have gone as fast as we can, but I can I tell you their 'fast' is not very fast.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - So it's the Commonwealth's fault?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - There is a critical path in the development of something like this and you have to tick off all your compliance. I want to make sure that if there are forty-spotted pardalotes that are going to hang out in the Peter Murrell Reserve, that we have done everything in our power to protect an endangered species within the scope of what you can do as a developer. We want to be a really good developer and we want a great development. It has been frustrating at times because of the things that have happened. We did not anticipate having an election this year, or the one last year.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Well, that makes a few of us around the table. I'm not sure how that impacts.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - During an election you actually can't go and procure. You have to do all the right things. You have to stop contract negotiations.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Caretaker lasts two months - we're talking eight weeks.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - No, it was actually longer than eight weeks for both of those things and because the Budget was delayed that didn't help either, so we've dealt with that around the procurement of procurement issues, but a lot of the things around the planning and how we were able to get the titles and all of the critical parts you have to do to get there has been longer than we had hoped. We have done everything that we can to move it forward.

**CHAIR** - Have you another question, Mr O'Byrne.

## PUBLIC

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Yes. Huntingfield is not the only place where you're delayed. We've been informed of another subdivision of Homes Tasmania in New Norfolk in McLeod Street. My understanding is you've had the titles now for over 12 months, closer to 18 months, but there has been a decision by Homes Tasmania and it's been described to me as 'applied design level', which has triggered unnecessarily a discretionary planning process with Brighton Council. Is that the case, because that's how it's been described to me? This may be an echo of Huntingfield where you might want to make the perfect the enemy of the good and nothing gets done.

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - My advice is that that property is in New Norfolk, so that would not be Brighton Council.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Sorry, so what council?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - Derwent Valley Council. That's a property owned by Loreto Community Housing that they did on our land. They've had trouble getting title for that, so that's in the hands of Loreto.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - But have you applied a design standard to that?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - No.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Okay, thank you.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Minister, I just want to touch on the board. Can you please provide detail of the cost incurred in the last financial year in flights, accommodation and other meeting expenses incurred by the Homes Tasmania board of directors?

**Mr VINCENT** - I think I've seen that. The board incurred the following costs between 1 July 2024 and 30 June 2025: remuneration, \$278,587; travel, including airfares, kilometres, accommodation and meals, \$26,815; IT expenditure, \$1,670; board management software and licences, \$18,406; meeting expenses, including venue hire and catering, \$2,798; consultants, \$5,000, for strategic support; and office supplies and other expenses, \$587. That gives us a total of \$333,872.

**Ms BROWN** - Is the Homes Tasmania board of directors provided with a State Service credit card?

**Ms MORGAN-THOMAS** - I think two of them have one for the purposes of booking flights and accommodation in hotels, so that's all captured in there.

**Ms BROWN** - Okay. Has the Homes Tasmania board met all reporting obligations under the *Homes Tasmania Act 2022*, including annual reports and dashboard updates?

**Mr VINCENT** - I understand that it has, yes.

**CHAIR** - Okay, right. We're going to take a break for five minutes.

**The committee suspended from 6.51 p.m. to 7.00 p.m.**

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - Welcome everybody back after that short break. We'll be going to H25, and the topic is Planning. Minister, do you need to introduce - oh, no, it's the same people at the table.

**Mr VINCENT** - Same people, yes.

**CHAIR** - Would you like to make an opening statement?

**Mr VINCENT** - No, I am happy to take questions.

**Mr WINTER** - I want to start with the statewide planning scheme, the flagship policy of the 2014 election. Here we are 11 years later, we still don't have a single statewide planning scheme. I heard that contribution from you in the Legislative Council Question Time last year where you outlined your frustrations with the planning scheme. Given we are, as I understand, 28 out of 29 councils - the last one to adopt it being my former council, I haven't been there for five years, I don't think I can be blamed. What are you going to do to fix this? Because, in all seriousness, the planning scheme, the new one, the councils and builders tell me it's even more complicated than the last. Our building construction numbers are still lower than they should be. It takes too long to build. At the end of this process, which is finally nearly over, how are we going to make it easier for people to build a home in this state?

**Mr VINCENT** - There's probably two parts to answer that. One is, with only one to come on board now and a little extension for Hobart and Kingborough there to tidy up, in the next couple of months, we'll have everybody on board. A lot of my focus over the last couple of months has been working with Mr Reid at the State Planning Office to understand what we need to do now to tidy things up to make it more effective. First up, TPPs will be put out tomorrow. That allows us to start work immediately on having the southern Tasmanian land-use strategy go out. That also complements then that the urban-growth boundary will make it a lot easier for the planning commission to allow subdivisions and everything to go through where - as you would well be aware of from your time on council - that was quite often a pushback to local councils when the developers were pushing the envelope.

We've also been talking with a lot of builders and developers about some of the frustrations that all people have. It doesn't matter whether you are general manager, councillor, a developer or a couple building a house. I know firsthand, having, over the last couple of years, been working on my daughter's house, some of the finer points. We've been looking at some of those bits and pieces, as I call them, or warts on the planning system that we might be able to smooth out with some different interpretations, so that we don't have 29 councils or 29 planning departments interpreting things slightly differently. I would like to see a lot more clarification on that and Mr Reid has some ideas that he wishes to develop in that area that I think will be good.

We've also identified, through talking to the builders, some of the little things, even on the positioning of driveways, for instance. Quite often the driveway goes in as part of the subdivision, then has to be pulled out to be moved to a unit or a house development. That's \$7000 to put it in, \$7000 to pull it out and put another one in. Little things like that add up to a large cost with some of the rural subdivisions that we see where the developer does a geo plan, fire, environmental plan and then a few months later, somebody comes and buys the blocks of land and has to do the same thing, same reports again.

## PUBLIC

**Mr WINTER** - You've heard the same things that I have. What process are you going to go through to make those changes in order to make this easier for people?

**Mr VINCENT** - We're identifying all of those, as I called, warts or bits and pieces at the moment and see whether it's legislation that's has to be changed, but some of them are in the regulations. Some are things that Mr Reid has indicated are interpretation, so putting out some clearer details about how we expect that to be interpreted, would take care of a lot of the little things that would tidy up and make for a quicker process with the planning scheme. As we're doing that, we're also looking for bits that may well be prohibitive to some of the developers being able to build houses quicker. I might ask Anthony Reid to expand on -a bit more detail on what I've just said.

**Mr REID** - Certainly, minister, through you. The focus over the last period of time is actually building a system and putting the system in place. The scheme's taken obviously probably longer than what we would have liked to have got the final bits in place. We're almost there obviously pending Kingborough coming online in the new year.

With that focus, we can now move to a system review. We need to be looking at the planning system as more of a living document from the policies through to the regional strategies through a constant look at review, identifying opportunities for revamping. A shining example was the residential standards work that we've had recently done, which has proposed a whole raft of amendments to the state planning provisions, particularly in the residential zones, which will give us an opportunity to modify those settings and improve them so that things like housing delivery, things like medium density apartments can be more readily rolled out under a new set of standards that would be implemented through amendments to the SPPs.

**Mr WINTER** - In terms of the TPPs, you've said that they're going to be released tomorrow. They were initially released in early 2023, so nearly two-and-a-half years ago. Why is it taking so long to get through the process?

**Mr VINCENT** - I can't answer that off the cuff, so I might ask Anthony Reid to just clarify that.

**Mr REID** - The original process to develop the TPPs was done a couple of years ago and there was obviously a statutory process that went through with hearings with the Tasmanian Planning Commission. They made a final recommendation report to the minister at the time to consider those, and then there's been -

**Mr WINTER** - When was that, sorry?

**Mr REID** - I don't have that on me right now. It would have been, I want to say late-2023 would have been when the report provided by the TPC would have been where the Government made changes in addressing the recommendations from the TPC. Then the process there has been obviously finalisation to release the TPPs and make them, as the minister pointed out.

**Mr WINTER** - Was it the intention that it would take two-and-a-half years or is this been -

**Mr VINCENT** - No, it's probably been one of the factors that's held up release of the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy that's been finished for a while, but it ended

## PUBLIC

up being a fairly big document. When I came into the role two-and-a-half months ago, it was one of the first conversations we had about how to simplify the document so it could be released because it was holding up the other steps. State planning officers worked well to get that done and now it is done, that's why we can release the land use strategies.

**Mr WINTER** - Was it a resourcing issue, that it took so long or what was the issue?

**Mr VINCENT** - Sorry, I've only been in the role for two-and-a-half months, I'm not aware of - I'll ask for clarification.

**Mr REID** - No, it wasn't a resourcing issue, minister. It was also getting it right with alignment. There was also some parallel work going on. The TPPs are actually a combination of a couple of things. They're actually the policy content of the existing regional land use strategies that have been elevated to a statewide planning level. There was also some work done to digest the report and the submissions received during the hearings process when the TPC undertook its assessment. All of that has culminated in work that has now been ready for release tomorrow.

**CHAIR** - Minister, I'm going to ask questions from the chair. You talked about the urban growth boundary and I'm just curious to know what you're considering in that space.

**Mr VINCENT** - Some of that was done by the previous minister where they announced the extra expansion of the urban growth boundary to take in -

**CHAIR** - So it's an expansion?

**Mr VINCENT** - It was an expansion there that was done in May this year was it?

**Mr REID** - This year, yes.

**Mr VINCENT** - A lot of that couldn't be acted on because it didn't fit with the land use strategy. A lot of it was in areas that were quite sensible, in areas around Hobart. The fact that we need to move with the land use strategy which will allow that to be freed up. When you read the TPPs, there is overarching comments in there about density and about urban growth to be reviewed so that we don't keep getting sprawl. We look at the density in some of the areas and that will allow us to develop some of the corridors much stronger with a higher density than what we probably have looked at before. It's going to make councils think twice about some of the development applications coming forward or developers about what they'll be able to actually do with the land with density instead of just the normal 'three-bedroom quarter-acre block'.

**CHAIR** - Just going back to the urban growth boundary, the idea that contains some of the growth, because we know that developing in areas where there isn't infrastructure is costly and there is benefit to doing more medium-density development in areas, and I'm pleased to hear about the benefits of the standards that have been produced. Can you assure the committee that there won't be unintentional consequences with urban growth, boundary sprawl?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, I know first-hand before coming into this role the expansion of the overgrowth boundary was more about identifying some of the areas in close within the

boundaries of townships, that was sensible to do so, not a busting out of the outer area of the urban growth boundary, so that was sensible.

It's something we really have to concentrate on because of that expansion of service. If the services aren't there and you'll see in the TPPs when you have a look at them, that subdivisions need to be looked at to the services that are there already, instead of developing areas outside of serviced areas. There has been some criticism from some developers that had land outside of the urban growth boundary wanting to do that.

The TPPs certainly make us think more before giving that the go ahead and have to tick a lot more boxes to make sure that it fits before that can happen. It is quite sensible, no guarantees of course, because everybody finds a way of pushing the boundaries, but it when you look at the TPPs, it does give you a lot of discretion to look at making sure that it fits within what you're doing already.

Expansion into new areas is very expensive for councils, which means it's very expensive for ratepayers and developers, of course. We're very conscious of that at the moment and the growth corridors need to be looked at with a higher density before we start busting out any further.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Just developing further on the chair's questions around that urban sprawl, obviously there is a significant need to densify in particular corridors, particularly around transport corridors and public transport corridors. The Southern Regional Land Use Strategy had a target around urban infill expectations and we have not met that. What are you doing in terms of trying to incentivise densification around those key transport and particularly public transport corridors?

**Mr VINCENT** - Certainly, with the studies especially around Hobart and Greater Hobart transport needs, it's interesting what's showing on some of those transport corridors, and one thing I have learned recently is that to intensify the transport and the higher density housing really works within about 800 metres of a transport mechanism. That's identified that we really need to concentrate and work with councils to understand how that land needs to be looked at and Glenorchy is a classic example of the layout there in the showgrounds and what they plan to do out there is a perfect example of the potential of how many blocks we can put on an area out there that's very close to the three transport corridors, as in Main Road, the potential of the old rail corridor and the Brooker Highway, for us to understand how we can maximise that effect.

Now, there's a classic example. When you look at the Eastern Shore and down to Kingborough, similar sorts of examples there. It's going to take a fair mindset, (A) from councils, and (B) from people living in those areas already. Some of those areas are pretty heavily commercial or industrialised, and it's hard to see sometimes how multi-unit developments or high-density may fit in that, but we have to spend a lot more time working through those situations so that it will work because people have to get used to the change, otherwise, we just can't keep expanding the way we are because we can't afford to keep the infrastructure up to expanding networks.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - This goes particularly to the previous portfolio dealing with housing and supply issues around that. It's a constraint. I think councils have expressed frustration that they are constrained with both resources and personnel around strategic land use planning. Is

your government working with councils, or how are they working with councils to free up those resources so they can do their strategic plans rather than just the development and assessment plans to be able to make those amendments to the planning schemes to provide for changes, say, from light industrial in Derwent Park, for instance, to urban residential?

**Mr VINCENT** - We have a body of work being done at the moment that's very close to coming back to us on the industrial land supply for Tasmania as a whole, which will fit with the land use strategies. We still have the two north-west and northern strategies to get in place. They've been a little bit behind the southern one, but we're moving as quickly as we can next year to bring them about, and that will identify a lot of the things you're talking about. Once we get the land use strategies in place we can sit back down again with LGAT and work through the various bodies to identify some of the work needed in these areas to intensify how we do it.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - We need more planners.

**Mr VINCENT** - We always need a lot more planners. We need a lot more builders, too.

**Mr JAENSCH** - We'll share them across councils, but that's a whole other story. Minister, it's really good news to hear that the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy is ready to go out. I want to ask two questions around that. Is that southern one a final release or is that for a period of public consultation? The second question to go with that is you mentioned the north and the north-west. What is the status of those two regional land use strategies and the timeline for them?

**Mr VINCENT** - The southern one is out for consultation tomorrow and I'm very lucky to have secured the employment to my office of the person who was involved in doing that, so our understanding within the office on things related to the land use strategy is now built into our day-to-day conversations as well, which I'm very pleased about. You think you know a bit after 14 years on council, but when you come into this role you realise that your knowledge is still very limited to probably 20 per cent or 30 per cent of the planning scheme.

As to the status of the two northern ones, we had some meetings recently and we are in talks at the moment about how we can bring them around and finalise them. There is a difference of opinion on the best way to go there, but we need to make sure they happen quickly, so there will be conversations in coming weeks to ensure they are finalised in 2026. We've got the consultation of the southern one going out now. I will check on how long it's going out for but that'll be our main concentration. Then we'll be focusing on working with the two northern ones and we'll have the southern one as a partial template for that to happen to bring them in as quickly as we possibly can. I'll just ask Mr Reid whether there's anything else he'd like to add to that answer.

**Mr REID** - No, it's good to finally get the regional land use strategy out and it probably goes to the heart of some of the other questions we heard about the urban growth boundary as well, minister, because obviously the urban growth boundary is an integral part of the regional land use strategies and it's a great opportunity for people to pass comment and put in a submission with respect to the southern strategy in particular. The other benefit of releasing it at the same time as the TPP's is that it will actually give a framework and a bit of a template for the north and the Cradle Coast who are a little bit behind schedule in terms of where the south was at, so this is a really good opportunity for activation of those strategies to sort of take

## PUBLIC

heed of what's been released and therefore kick on and get the north and Cradle Coast ones done in in quick fashion.

**Mr VINCENT** - The southern one is open for consultation until 22 February, allowing for the holiday mode over Christmas, of course, so that we get that done properly.

**Mr WINTER** - Going back to one of your earlier answers, minister, you said in relation to the urban growth boundary expansion that it couldn't be acted on because it didn't fit with the land use strategy, so as part of that there were -

**Mr VINCENT** - Sorry, some areas in regional areas, yes.

**Mr WINTER** - Some areas, yes. What were those areas that weren't able to be acted on?

**Mr VINCENT** - It was where the Southern Tasmanian Land Use Strategy didn't correspond on the same boundaries.

**Mr WINTER** - Some of the places were Rokeby, Sorell, Brighton, Margate - which of those areas were unable to be acted on?

**Mr VINCENT** - I can use Sorell as an example, because I know the area - where the bypass went through, so all the airport side of the highway there.

**Mr WINTER** - What was the benefit of doing the urban growth boundary expansion if the Southern Regional Land Use Strategy didn't allow for construction there anyway?

**Mr VINCENT** - I wasn't minister then, so I can't answer that other than it did fit with a lot of other areas and it was a sensible thing in one way, to look at and have the discussion with the councils, believing that the land use strategy was imminent.

**Mr WINTER** - Will there be any development that actually comes from the expansion of the urban growth boundary?

**Mr VINCENT** - I will have to check and get back to you on that. I'm not sure of the exact lines in the various municipalities, but we could check.

**Mr REID** - It's important to understand what the urban growth boundary actually is. It's obviously in the strategy which specifies literally the boundary as to where we want urban growth to go. It doesn't rezone the land, and that's obviously the next logical step, once you're inside that boundary, it actually gives the guidance, if you like, to the TPC assessment for a resigning application, to turn that into some form of urban development. It might be a residential zone -

**Mr WINTER** - The answer earlier was that even though the boundary had been expanded, those areas didn't meet with the Regional Land Use Strategy, and therefore the development couldn't actually happen.

**Mr REID** - Sorry, my understanding of the minister's answer there was that the parcels of land that were incorporated into the urban growth boundary for this very reason, so that they could be considered for a rezone. Currently, if they sit outside the urban growth boundary, there

## PUBLIC

is a very small mechanism through the southern strategy which enables them to be considered for rezoning by the TPC. If they sit outside the urban growth boundary the test for rezoning is actually really difficult and therefore by including them inside the urban growth boundary there's an opportunity for the landowners to apply to have that land rezoned.

**Mr WINTER** - Isn't the urban growth boundary - isn't part of doing the Regional Land Use Strategy is to amend the urban growth boundary?

**Mr REID** - That's one aspect, yes.

**Mr WINTER** - So why go through the process of expanding the urban growth boundary before you've done the Southern Regional Land Use Strategy? What was the benefit of that?

**Mr REID** - That was the decision of the minister at the time, in terms of freeing up an array of land across the full spectrum.

**Mr WINTER** - Has there been any practical - has it facilitated an attempted rezoning at any of those areas at Risdon Road, Sorell or Margate, for example?

**Mr REID** - Through you, minister, I'm not aware of any changes as yet, noting that the amendments to the urban growth boundary were only done earlier this year.

**Mr WINTER** - It happened in May and nothing's happened. Now, tomorrow we're releasing the Regional Land Use Strategy which allows for the proper, strategic growth of southern Tasmania anyway. I just don't understand why the urban growth boundary process has occurred. It doesn't seem to have actually helped or done anything. Minister, do you have anything to say about that?

**Mr VINCENT** - The intent was to update, to consider whether there was sufficient land for housing in the greater Hobart area, bringing forward some changes that would otherwise not occur until after the comprehensive review is completed. The land use strategy, in my knowledge of that, complements both together. It didn't at the time in all areas but did in some areas. Whether or not developers have used that ability to increase their subdivision applications, I'm not across that.

**Mr WINTER** - Were any representations received from property owners on any of those sites; for example, Margate, Rokeby or any of those sites, were representations received from the landowners impacted by the urban growth boundary expansion?

**CHAIR** - Last question, Mr Winter.

**Mr VINCENT** - I'm not aware of that, having only been in the role for the last two-and-a-half months.

**Mr WINTER** - Would you take that on notice?

**Mr VINCENT** - I can take that on notice.

**Mr WINTER** - Thank you. Thank you, Chair, for your patience.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - It's wearing a bit thin, actually, but not because of you, it's the hour of the day. Minister, just continuing on in relation to the Regional Land Use Strategy, I'm very, very pleased to hear that that's out for consultation. That seems like a big win. I hope that it delivers exactly what we want it to. Ms Johnston and I are very interested in making sure that we can utilise underutilised land within that area, particularly between Hobart and Glenorchy. I wonder what conversations you're having with councils, with community organisations that are interested in ensuring that there is that land that can be basically unlocked for medium-density housing; how are you making that happen in that area?

**Mr VINCENT** - Over the short period of the last couple of months, I've had some intermediate conversations with the councils I've been visiting. Mainly my focus has been on making sure the TPPs come into play and then the land use strategy and those discussions will happen now that we are going through their consultation period. I now have the triggers to be able to have more sensible conversations with a mechanism for being able to work through that.

**CHAIR** - That mechanism may change that zoning within. I'm interested, as you're aware, of having possibly a pilot project, as was proposed by the Planning Institute of Australia's Tasmanian branch, in that that transit corridor.

**Mr VINCENT** - This is a developing area that will happen. There will be a lot more information after because we will be in a different phase of the planning around greater Hobart. In the short time I've been in the role, I haven't yet had a lot of those discussions, but talking to a lot of the different groups involved and that will accelerate.

**CHAIR** - Could you use that as a pilot to utilise elsewhere?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, there will be a lot more focus on that. We have the business case being looked at the moment for the rapid bus mechanism out through the corridor, out through Glenorchy. That will trigger a whole heap of different conversations that we need to consider and look at. I have been out to the showgrounds to look at the land there, and there are different views on the amount of dwellings that we could put on a section of land like that and it's a maturing conversation that we will have to be a vital part of. Like I said, 800 metres either side of the transport corridor is where the more intense or density levels need to be looked at.

**CHAIR** - For clarification, the transit corridor: are you talking about the railway line or are you talking about the road, or what are you identifying as the transport corridor?

**Mr VINCENT** - All three are a significant part of the future. They're there. That's what we have, that's what we have to work with. It's not just a case of looking at one, but how it may be in between the two. It's all open for consideration and a rethink of how it needs to happen, and we have to do a lot of work with council on that.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Point of clarification, minister. It is the rail corridor not the old rail corridor. I maintain that until my dying breath.

**Mr VINCENT** - I will accept that clarification.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Thank you, minister. I would be hung, drawn and quartered if I didn't make that clarification from a number of people in the community. As I understand it, the draft

## PUBLIC

Southern Regional Land Use Strategy will be out for consultation tomorrow; can you please indicate how much input the Greater Hobart Committee under the *Greater Hobart Act* has had into the development of that draft.

Mr Winter, who's not here at the moment, and I, in previous life, have sat on that committee and it was a very key concern of the committee in terms of good land use planning, transport infrastructure planning. How much has that committee had? I'm not sure if it still exists, to be honest so if you can enlighten me, I will be pleased.

**Mr VINCENT** - I can't answer it myself because of the short time I've been in the role, but I will refer to Mr Reid.

**Mr REID** - I'm not aware of extensive consultation with the Greater Hobart Committee in terms of its development. However, it was the substance of the document and certainly refinement, but prior to it handing over to the State Planning Office earlier this year was work done by a regional coordinator and with the councils in particular. There was a steering committee with some representatives across local government representation that was for the southern strategy that facilitated that work and enabled the southern strategy to be developed to a draft standard, ready for public consultation. And, then - now is a great opportunity for engagement across the board on the strategy and updating it.

**Mr VINCENT** - The secretary can add a bit more to that as well.

**Mr LIMKIN** - Thank you, and through you, minister. Just to confirm, that committee still exists, Ms Johnston.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Oh, thank you.

**Mr LIMKIN** - It does meet - the Greater Hobart Advisory Committee, which I chair with the CEOs of the councils - met in October of this year and talked about how we can enable medium-density housing in key urban precincts and transport corridors -

**Mr WINTER** - That's funny. We were talking about that in 2018.

**Mr LIMKIN** - as part of that work, and looking at transit-orientated development, which the Chair mentioned, around the rapid buses and the rail corridor.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - So, that body of work, and my understanding - Mr Winter might be able to correct me here - is that in 2020-21, there was a significant amount of work conducted by the committee around transport drivers, infrastructure drivers, mapping out across the four metropolitan councils about need. That has been informed or has been a part of an input into the regional land use strategy draft?

**Mr WINTER** - There's a Metro plan, isn't there? Didn't that get done?

**Ms JOHNSTON** - There was a significant body of work that I know a number of planners - I'm trying to think, was it Garry Auld and others from, I forget now, it's been a little while ago - but there was a significant amount of work done by a number of strategic planners to try to inform you.

## PUBLIC

**Mr REID** - Through you, minister. I'm not entirely sure. It was drafted through that process with the steering committee oversight. I imagine that that important work is front and centre and ought to be included in the strategy, and now with being open for consultation and finalisation is a great opportunity to revisit that.

**Mr WINTER** - Wasn't there a Metro plan developed through the Hobart City deal that was to inform the - sorry, that was to sit and inform the southern regional land use strategy?

**Ms JOHNSTON** - It was supposed to be. Yes, that's the one.

**CHAIR** - Yes. I think the southern regional land use strategy might have really taken over.

**Mr WINTER** - In terms of the southern regional land use strategy and the northern and north-west. At the moment, you have, as I understand, Cradle Coast playing an active role. You have members from local government. Are you seeking to bring that work back in house, of the north-west and northern schemes, and, if so, when's that going to happen?

**Mr VINCENT** - It has been discussed. They would prefer to keep it in the north and north-west, that amount of work. We have to have the discussion about how quickly that work needs to happen to be common sense, because it has dragged. They are doing different bodies of work and they have gathered some momentum in recent terms, so those discussions are due to be had.

**Mr WINTER** - So, Cradle Coast Authority is providing the backing and support to a bunch of local government reps on the committee. And in the north, who's providing that secretariat support?

**Mr VINCENT** - NTD.

**Mr WINTER** - When did the processes start for both of those two?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'll just seek that from the State Planning Office.

**Mr REID** - Through you, minister. I'll have to check on the time. A regional coordinator has been a funded position from the State Government for a period of time that we've provided funding to the local council authorities to employ and the regional coordinators have been the ones responsible for pulling the work on all the strategies together.

There has been a changeover in a lot of those regional coordinators, and there's been a bit of staff turnover in both the north and the Cradle Coast, but for the last - I want to say six to 12 months, there has been quite a steady appointment of a regional coordinator on both. The progress that's been made since we've had that stability going forward has actually been quite good, and we're seeing those results through the various steering communities of which the state is represented on as well.

**Mr WINTER** - When would you expect those to be ready for public consultation?

**Mr REID** - Well, there's two aspects to that. The TPP released today and the southern strategy as a template is a really good turning point for them to now start to focus their attention on getting on with the drafts proper. The real advantage with the south that enabled us to release

## PUBLIC

them for public consultation is the fact that, by the time it was handed back over to the state, it was a penultimate draft. That work is still a fair way off in both the Cradle Coast and the north. However, I believe that, with the release of the TPPS and the southern strategy as a template, by the middle of next year we should be seeing a similar stage in the north and Cradle Coast of penultimate drafts that are ready for consultation.

**Mr WINTER** - Yes, so draft out middle of next year for north-west and north and then the process. How long's the process from going to consultation to having something finalised and in place?

**Mr REID** - Well, we're consulting with the south over a three-month period, noting that it's during Christmas, so it's actually up to the minister of the day as to how long that consultation process will be. Then finalisation shortly thereafter - after receiving submissions and making relevant amendments.

**Mr WINTER** - Mightn't make it easy, but minister, can you commit to having those regional land use strategies in place by the end of next year?

**Mr VINCENT** - We would certainly be aiming to by the end of next year.

**CHAIR** - Minister, in 2022, the 30-year Greater Hobart Plan released in collaboration between Hobart, Clarence, Glenorchy, and Kingborough councils asserted that there was enough urban land available to house 60,000 more people in those municipalities and that there was no need to extend the urban growth boundary to do so. What are you doing to try to get that housing? Mainly, I'm looking at residential solutions. What are you doing to enable that?

**Mr VINCENT** - For the short time I've been in the role, I can say that it hasn't been on the radar. Now we have the TPPs coming in and the land use strategy, the conversations will change to be able to maximise the available land for development as quickly as possible.

**CHAIR** - We see an example recently, the K&D block in Hobart has been sold by the university for the same amount they bought it for to an anonymous developer, and there are feelings that that may not be for housing, it might be for a commercial use that may not really be acceptable. What do you - how do you facilitate more social - or, housing in inner-city Hobart?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'll hand to the secretary, but there is a fair bit of conversation going on behind the scenes about the commercial viability of a site such as that to have the commercial and residential blend to make it commercially viable for a developer. Secretary, do you have some more information on that?

**Mr LIMKIN** - Thank you, minister and through you, and I will throw to Mr Reid in a second as well. In relation to the K&D site specifically, I have had conversations with the university about how we work together with that developer. Every indication that I have received is from the university, I have not yet had a conversation with the developer, that opportunity will come shortly, but every indication I've had from the university is that the developer is open to working with the state and local governments, and looking at including social affordability housing on the site. It is something that I intend to pick up with them directly. In addition, we are having conversations with council about what we can do to support

infill growth. So, what mechanisms could council do, could state government do, to support the private sector to develop it - to remove barriers, remove red tapes.

Also, as you would appreciate, there's been an increase in cost of supply. Escalation has gone up quite significantly over the last four years, so what are the levers that we all have to do that? I have not had the chance yet to meet with the new Director-General in Treasury, Ben Miller, is accountable for, you know, housing at the Commonwealth level. We're arranging that conversation in early next year but he's also keen to have a face-to-face conversation about what leverage federal government can use, particularly in relation to the apartments and medium-density housing inbuild and that's a planning conversation as well. Anthony, is there anything you want to add?

**Mr REID** - Through you, minister. Probably just that note you mentioned on the residential standards review work. That's a really good focal point for how we can update the planning system and the SPPs in particular to facilitate development. I think it's important to also note that - and, certainly the conversations I've been having at a national level with colleagues in the state is that Planning has been doing a lot of the heavy lifting over the last period in terms of residential housing supply and it by itself is not going to be the silver bullet that will solve all the housing shortage issues we're seeing not only here, but also nationally. Planning reform needs to be well thought out with other initiatives to facilitate that type of development.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Minister, you obviously had previous extensive experience being on a planning authority in your previous role, and I'm sure through that you would appreciate the expectation of community to be involved in planning processes, to be able to make representations, to be able to appeal decisions and the importance that is placed on the community. Are you concerned about the number of bills we've seen over the last 18 months to two years come before this place which circumvent or fast-track proper planning processes?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes and no. That's an awkward thing to answer with all my hats on over the years. The complexity and the legalities of planning have made it quite difficult for the diverse nature that a lot of councils have, from community people to business people and everything in between, to cope with some of the developments. The types of developments that are happening and the growth into some of the regional areas where I was a councillor push you to the limits and push some of the planners within those councils to the limit. Some of the things like the DAPs we've talked about, although it might not have been correct and didn't go through, I'd like to think that the new version we're putting there will allow councils to have options where they feel things are outside their ability to deal.

It's a bit of each. It's a hard balancing act, as you well know, to get it right. It's sometimes hard to wear the emotion that you do of how you see your town or area versus what needs to be, say, higher density in that area over your own back fence. We have to deal with the complications of each of those areas delicately, but not all councils have the ability to handle some of it and not all councillors have the capacity to handle it, but they still need to be involved with the process all the way through because it is their town or their community.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - I appreciate you've raised the issue of DAPs and I noticed that a week or so ago you announced the grandson of DAPs, and I believe we're up to version three now. As you pointed out, the original version of DAPs was wholly rejected by the upper House last year, I think it was.

## PUBLIC

**Mr WINTER** - And the former Planning minister blamed Labor, despite us being the only ones that voted for it.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - At that time when we debated that legislation, the community was incredibly vocal about the importance of community involvement in planning matters and local councils and the role, and it was very clear that local government also expressed considerable concern about DAPs. What have you done for the grandson of DAPs to engage with local government about their concerns relating to the original DAPs bill?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'm glad it's the grandson; at my age I have a few grandchildren, so I've just accumulated a new one too.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - You have to name them, otherwise we'll get confused about which one we're talking about.

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, I'm sure we will be having a lot of conversations on the next version which has been simplified and the ministerial ability to determine some of those things taken out, so it's a lot clearer on the three points, which are for social and affordable housing or subdivisions to facilitate social and affordable housing by Homes Tasmania or a registered community housing provider; second, an applicant or a planning authority, with consent of the applicant, where the development is over \$10 million in the city or \$5 million outside the city; and the third, where council is both the applicant and the planning authority and the proposal is above the \$1 million value threshold. That's a handy thing for councils to have if it is a major thing to take away that ambiguity that developers or some of the residents have against council in some situations there, to have it looked at by the TPC instead.

I think this is a fair tool for councils to use. It still has their involvement in some situations where the councillors would like to have an opinion other than what their planning staff have suggested is the legal situation to accept or reject the planning. Through this process, it gives them the ability to have more say into that development than they would in some circumstances.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - In that process you've outlined you've talked about how the applicant can elect to have it referred to a DAP with the consent of the applicant. It talks a lot about the applicant, the developer in this particular situation, it doesn't talk about the needs of community in terms of representations and representors. Do you understand and appreciate the concerns of the community that they will have a process, which currently is very much around community and the appropriate development of that community, taken out of their hands at the request of a developer or council and they don't have the same involvement? They won't be allowed, for instance, to have merit-based appeals and they'll be limited in terms of what they can be involved in.

**Mr VINCENT** - I will move to the secretary. He has a document there to clarify some of that.

**Mr LIMKIN** - Thank you, minister. My understanding, Ms Johnston, is as part of the 14-day exhibition period that the development application panel will have, community members, applicants and reviewing entities can still make representations to the DAP. The community will still be able to have that representation.

## PUBLIC

**Ms JOHNSTON** - I appreciate that, but they can't make a representation on whether it gets referred to a DAP. My point is that the community are cut out of that decision-making process, so it's very much led by a developer. From the community's perspective, the lens is that it's all about pro-development rather than about good outcomes for the community.

**Mr VINCENT** - That could be balanced by the fact that if the TPC looks at it, the developer mightn't get what they actually want through that process either and they have to deal with the umpire's decision. There is going to be a lot of thought before they go through that process, so I think that would balance things up a bit as well.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Back to my original question about consultation with the Local Government Association on the grandson of DAPs, has that occurred or will occur?

**Mr REID** - An aspect that probably hasn't really been discussed as much as it ought to as well is often sometimes two people acting on a planning authority can feel a little bit conflicted because they get developments in front of them that conform to the planning system or whatever else, but actually require -

**Ms JOHNSTON** - It's a pleasure of the job; you suck it up.

**Mr REID** - We've certainly had representation in the past from certain councillors that have said, 'I've got community members and constituents approaching me saying that this is a terrible outcome and we don't want this thing to occur, but I've got to put my planning hat on and do the planning authority'. In some respects, the Development Assessment Panel piece is a mechanism by which councillors or elected members can make representation to the process as well without the conflict of acting like a planning authority. With the current DAP, councils are involved in the process at a statutory level through referral because they are relevant agencies that needs to be consulted, but members of councils as elected members are able to make submissions to the statutory assessment process as well.

**Mr WINTER** - Just going back to the regional land use strategies, the election policy said they would:

... bring the finalisation of the updated regional land use strategies in-house to accelerate completion and unlock coordinated region-wide land use planning.

I want to clarify your earlier answer that that is going to happen? You are taking the regional land use strategies off Cradle Coast and Northern Development Corporation and bringing them in-house?

**Mr VINCENT** - No, I think I said we're in discussions with them over the most couple of weeks for the best way to handle that.

**Mr REID** - The intent would be that at a particular point in time there needs to be a penultimate draft. We need them at a similar stage is the southern strategy when it was brought back in, because that's the perfect time to finalise it ready for public consultation.

**Mr WINTER** - So you won't actually bring it back in-house until they're at the point of advertising the new strategy. Is that right?

## PUBLIC

**Mr REID** - That's true. We're in the process at the moment of talking with those councils about some supplementary funding from internal sources to be able to get them through to arguably the middle of next year when we're expecting them to hand them back to the government.

**Mr WINTER** - My understanding of the policy, and I think the expectation from industry, was it meant this would happen imminently. Was that not the intention, minister?

**Mr VINCENT** - The intention is to have it happen as quickly as we can make it happen, and Mr Reid's been looking at the most efficient way because they've done so much of the work so far, where we kick in, what we would have to duplicate or look at separately and which is the best way to go. We're right at that point at the moment discussing those things.

**Mr REID** - The finalisation of the TPPs, like I said before, and the release of the southern strategy now gives them ample opportunity to have a template of which to follow through. The efficiency through which these can be delivered over the next period will be sped up over that period of time.

**Mr VINCENT** - We want to make it as quick as we can.

**Mr WINTER** - We couldn't have gone much slower. I think it's been 12 years or something. The draft TPPs earlier this year, if I recall correctly, had some pretty negative feedback from a couple of developers I spoke to. They had a range of concerns about there being, again, more red tape and making things harder rather than easier. Can you run us through the changes that you've made based on that consultation to ensure that you're making the remaining scheme simpler, not more complicated?

**Mr VINCENT** - I will ask Mr Reid to answer that because they were being developed as I come into the role.

**Mr REID** - I am probably just an important caveat as well, while they're being made tomorrow, they're not coming into effect until the middle of next year, and there's good reason for that. That gives a window of time for users of the planning system to understand the TPPs and if there are any outstanding or underlying issues, there's an opportunity to rectify over that overdue course.

**Mr WINTER** - Does that mean if you lodge an application, does that affect the application going in or just the assessment of the applications?

**Mr REID** - Against the TPPs?

**Mr WINTER** - For example, if you lodge an application on 1 January 2026, is that not included? Does that mean that application won't be assessed against the new TPPs?

**Mr REID** - No, because the TPPs won't be in effect until 1 July 2026.

**Mr WINTER** - Is there a potential here that if you have made significant improvements through the TPPs, and I certainly hope you have, that people might wait to lodge their applications until 1 July?

**Mr REID** - It can be viewed both ways. The other thing we need to remember here as well is that the TPPs go hand in glove with the regional land use strategies and they're implemented and affected through the regional land use strategies. The TPPs are a high-level policy document that set the government's vision for how we want our areas to look across the state. They set very high-level principles for things like settlement, urban land availability, growth, how we manage things like natural hazards, natural and cultural, environmental matters as well.

They're not designed to apply at a development application level. They're designed to be applied through the other various instruments in the planning system, most notably the regional land use strategies. Because the next levels of the system, including the Tasmanian Planning Scheme, need to be consistent with those higher order instruments, you get a situation on where you're applying a planning scheme that has those principles embedded within it.

**CHAIR** - Mr Winter, I'd like to ask a question.

**Mr WINTER** - You are the boss, Chair, so you get to do whatever you like.

**CHAIR** - I'd like to have a fair chance to ask my questions as well. Minister, this is repeating the questions around DAPs, but I want to lay out what's occurred. We see the reintroduction of the development assessment panels, and they were first introduced in 2024, and they were strongly opposed by community, receiving 92 per cent submissions against. When it was reintroduced in April 2025 by minister Ellis, few changes were made, and it was voted down by the Legislative Council. Now in November 2025, we've seen the reintroduction of the DAPs yet again despite ongoing opposition. I'm curious to know: you sound like you want the DAPs to do things that perhaps they won't. If the development assessment panels process is reintroduced and it fails, will you abandon reintroducing it yet again?

**Mr VINCENT** - Great grandchild. That is a hypothetical. We have a lot of work to do on the present situation, and I take advice as we work through that situation. Totally hypothetical so I couldn't go there.

**CHAIR** - Perhaps if the mechanism of the DAPs is something that you want it to be but it may not deliver all of those outcomes such as streamlining, planning, making it easier for developments to go through. What other mechanisms would you look at improving that access to building homes for Tasmanians?

**Mr VINCENT** - There's been quite a few things we'd need to look at there. You say about the opposition, but there is also a lot of people within council and within council laws being slightly different and the development world that thinks that a sensible version adapts it makes the planning scheme stronger. I spoke about that in the last vote, probably a little bit different to how it was perceived at the time, but talking from my experience as a mayor and I still wear a little bit of that hat as we all do and can't get rid of.

I think we still have to get that balance in the planning scheme to allow for sensible developments to happen in the complications of the developments going forward. I think even to pursue higher density projects, we will be taking people outside their comfort zones as well when we have those areas, so we will continue to work through those things.

## PUBLIC

I'm open to all conversations. I've never closed-minded to this. It's out there for consultation, we've had an initial discussion with Local Government Association, and we will continue to do so.

**CHAIR** - Do you feel that it disregards the opinions of people who know their local areas?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'm one of those people that know my area very well and they've lived and breathed it for the last 15 years. Like I said, there's conflicting views and I'm happy to take all views on board, as I always am.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Minister, arguably the mother of all DAPs was the TPC assessment of the stadium. Yet, your government wholly rejected the findings of that particular DAP. Do you find this hypocritical that you're suggesting that we should be progressing DAPs as a way of taking the politics out of planning, but then at the same time with the TPC decision and the stadium, you've just completely ignored the decision of that?

**Mr VINCENT** - Anybody in that position of this local government, state or federal, needs to weigh up the advice that's before them at any given time and make decisions based on that. All things that we look at from all different parts of this TPC or whether its planner's recommendations and it's no different to a council voting against the planner's recommendation. Sometimes that just happens, not that often, but sometimes it does.

We make decisions on the best of our ability, given time, on the knowledge that we have and it's not for everybody to agree or disagree, but that's part of governing.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - With councils making a decision, it's a different proposition for a state government to overturn another elected body's decision than it is to overturn an independent authority's position. It'd be quite unusual for a state government to overturn a planning decision of a council, for instance, but we have had, as we have seen in the last week or so, a state government try to overturn the decision of a DAP planning assessment process.

**Mr VINCENT** - Probably highlighted some of the frustrations of the different levels of government with some of the decisions that are made, and we all have those frustrations that we deal with as specific we can.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Can I ask also in relation to third-party appeal rights, your predecessor indicated that he was wanting to table legislation in relation to limiting or restricting third-party appeal rights, is that your intention to still pursue that particular policy?

**Mr VINCENT** - I have to seek advice on that.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - I understand it was minister Ellis at the time's intention to have unique -

**Mr VINCENT** - I'll refer that to the State Planning Office.

**Mr REID** - I understand that the policy position's still current, but it's not a priority given the other items that we've got on our plate in terms of delivery at this point in time.

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - It's not something that's on my desk.

**Mr WINTER** - What is their policy position?

**Ms JOHNSTON** - To remove third-party appeal rights. Minister Ellis, I believe it was again late last year maybe, announced that it was a government position to table - intended to table legislation to limit third-party appeal rights.

**Mr WINTER** - I will keep going on that. The government's position then was - and we've heard it remains - is it wants to remove third-party appeal rights. Is that the ability for someone to appeal to the Tasmanian Planning Commission against the decision of a local government authority?

**Mr VINCENT** - Sorry, it's not on my desk at the moment, it's not on my radar and I'm not across it. Unless the State Planning Office has something else to say?

**Mr REID** - It was to clarify who was eligible to make an appeal to TASCAT based on a planning decision that was made.

**Mr WINTER** - Right. Actually, I'm going to move off this. What time do we finish, Chair?

**CHAIR** - 8.25 p.m.

**Mr WINTER** - 8.25 p.m.? Okay, I will keep going then. Who would be eligible to appeal under that current policy, or who would be ineligible? Whatever's easiest for you to answer.

**Mr REID** - I understand the current settings are around if you've made a representation during the planning process, that's when you're entitled to make a review. My understanding around this was a mechanism to remove vexatious or non-applicable third-party appeals, and it was designed to be a definition around - I don't want to use the term 'ineligible person' because that's not quite the right word - but it's those who are genuinely aggrieved by the decision of the planning authority.

**Mr WINTER** - How would someone assess whether an appeal was vexatious or otherwise?

**Mr REID** - My understanding is that TASCAT makes these decisions every day in terms of working out whether the appeal is a genuine one, based on the planning matter for which the application was either refused, permitted or granted, and that they determine whether the issue that was raised as an appeal is within the jurisdiction to be heard.

**Mr WINTER** - But if they're already doing this every day, then what's the policy change?

**Mr REID** - My understanding is it was a clarification of the definition.

**Mr WINTER** - Right. It doesn't sound like a very big change, but it sounds like a good headline for former minister Ellis, anyway.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - I think it was to limit groups in particular from appealing.

## PUBLIC

**Mr WINTER** - Oh, okay. I'm going to move on, if that's okay with you, Chair.

**CHAIR** - Yes, certainly.

**Mr WINTER** - Okay, good. It's getting late. I've got a list here of all of the announced planning reforms I could find: abolish outdated building laws; streamline subdivision approvals and embed them in the planning scheme for consistency; bringing to the House to finalise Tasmania's outdated regional - we've talked about that; give councils powers to fast-track rezonings; introduce deemed approval rules, so housing applications are automatically approved if councils miss deadlines; limit excessive requests for information; and expand granny flat size limits to 90 metres squared, to support flexible housing options - I will stop there for now. Are these actually happening? When will we ever see these announced reforms?

**Mr VINCENT** - I touched on this with a couple of other answers. Now that we have the TPPs in place and the Southern Tasmanian Land Use Strategy being consulted, we will go back now and have a look at all things that we need to do to make things happen quicker. In the short time I've been in the role, the concentration has been on those two things happening. Those sorts of things and any other points that the councils wish to raise, or we do through the State Planning Office that will speed up the system we will be looking at, but I haven't got a list of those, at the moment.

**Mr WINTER** - Modernise environmental and planning laws to cut duplication and speed up approvals; draft legislation for development assessment panels, which we've talked about; remove third-party appeals that stall projects, we've talked about; amend the *Housing Land Supply Act* to genuinely accelerate land release for new homes; implement the Improving Residential Standards project to modernise planning rules for housing; finalise the Tasmanian planning policies to provide a clear framework for future development; and review the state planning provisions to make improvements to Tasmania's planning system. Are you committed to all of those reforms?

**Mr VINCENT** - Look, I can't remember all that you've mentioned there, but the state planning provisions are under review as we speak, is that correct?

**Mr REID** - The five-yearly review was conducted a few years ago, and then obviously there was a range of projects that fell out of that: improving residential standards is a shining example of a project that fell out of that review, so there are amendments to the SPPs. This also comes back to a comment I was making originally around getting onto a regular review pattern, with regards to the state planning provisions and the scheme, to ensure that it remains contemporary. There are new mechanisms of delivery, there's new information and innovative ways of delivering housing that we see come on board every day, and it's a matter of making sure the scheme is obviously nimble enough to keep up with those changes.

**Mr VINCENT** - And we will be going back through all those points to see what needs to be done to make the system more straightforward for everybody involved.

**CHAIR** - Last one.

**Mr WINTER** - I have only one more on this, if that's all right with you, Chair. In terms of the resourcing for that, there's a lot of work there. Is the SPO going to be resourced

## PUBLIC

accordingly to get some of this work done, have they additional money coming in this Budget or after that to resource themselves to get things done?

**Mr VINCENT** - If the secretary would like to have a go at this, because I believe a fair bit has been put into the Budget to make sure that they are there for projects.

**Mr LIMKIN** - Mr Winter, part of my job as secretary is to ensure that government priorities are delivered. Earlier this year, I moved resources around within the department to provide the additional resource for the delivery or the coordination of the regional land use strategies and the work with councils.

I regularly review priorities of the government with ministers and make sure resources are appropriately allocated, if there are additional resources needed, to follow and resolve those issues that you've mentioned. That is part of my job. I'm not aware of any issues that I need to resolve at this stage. I meet weekly with Mr Reid, so at this stage, I believe the State Planning Office has the sufficient resources to continue the work that they're doing, noting that a number of the comments that you've talked about are probably in the CBOS area, so I didn't want to say I can only answer about the ones that are under my accountability, but we do really focus on that.

**Mr VINCENT** - I might just add to that, the \$385,000 in the 2025-26 for planning system reforms which were originally announced in the 2021-20 -

**Mr WINTER** - How much was that, sorry?

**Mr VINCENT** - It was \$385,000. The Budget also provides an additional \$300,000 for supporting crucial major projects and strategic regional development.

**CHAIR** - That's your one question. Is that it?

**Mr WINTER** - I had just one more and then I can go and let you do the rest, if you want. In the Budget, on budget paper 1, page 247, output group 8, Housing and Planning. The State Planning Office receives an uptick in funding for this financial year. You've gone from about \$600,000 for this current financial year and then it goes back to equivalent funding; so is that 600,000 for a particular purpose this year and, if so, does that mean we're going to go back to a position where the State Planning Office isn't able to properly resource what should be a big reform agenda going forward?

**CHAIR** - It's a very good question, Mr Winter.

**Mr VINCENT** - I have just indicated what those two amounts were for. We were into a new budget process then of what we will need in the future, but the \$385,000 and the \$300,000 was what I just read out.

**Mr WINTER** - Is there an intention for them to keep going in the following year, though?

**Mr VINCENT** - If there are other projects that need to fit in with reform, we will address those issues.

**Mr WINTER** - I reckon there will be.

**CHAIR** - Minister, we've talked about housing as a crisis over the course of this afternoon and this evening, but equally, Tasmania faces issues around climate change. I wonder how the regional land use strategy and the approach that the government might take could properly address issues around climate change. There's not really the head of power. There's a lot of subjective approach in relation to acting on climate change, but how do you use the planning system to ensure that Tasmanians have a climate-ready future?

**Mr VINCENT** - The TPP certainly has climate as part of what they look at, and when I read through those several times, I thought that's going to allow councils to stop and think a little bit differently about that area. It's not an area that I've had in a short time in the ministry to get too far into. I am very conscious of it and anything else other than that I'd probably have to take on board and just examine as we go forward to how it can fit, but it is a very serious subject. I know we are talking about a lot in infrastructure, about roads and bridges and where we need to be in the future, and any time we are looking at designs of roads in certain areas we're trying to take into account the effect of possible climate change and what that might mean going forward with those roads and how it services those areas. But that's about the detail I have at the present.

**CHAIR** - Is there any charter for wellbeing? I know that the Health minister yesterday spoke and provided a report of preventive health and wellbeing strategies, and she was talking about that being very much embedded across agencies - a whole-of-government approach to health. I'm just curious to know, minister, whether it is clear that health outcomes in a changing climate will be addressed through planning?

**Mr VINCENT** - I will refer that to Mr Reid.

**Mr REID** - The Tasmanian planning policies at the moment, as being made, are first suite. So, there is scope for the minister to add to - for lack of better word - the 'chapters to the book', so if there are future issues or matters like Health, like climate-related matters, they can be added to the TPPs.

The general effect of that is, because of the lower instruments of the planning system including the regional land use strategies, the scheme itself and local provisions need to be consistent with those higher instruments. Then, naturally, the policy intent or effect of those can be put through the scheme.

It comes back to that matter I was talking before about treating things like the Tasmanian planning policies and regional land strategies as a bit more of a living document that can be readily updated as new issues arise and policy directions of government change.

**CHAIR** - Just to finish up on that: I mean, that would be the obvious place to embed that so it was really instructive for how planning schemes are interpreted and planning is interpreted across. Can we have an undertaking, minister, that you will look at those two issues of preventive health and climate change?

**Mr VINCENT** - Certainly I can take it on board. Everything I'm trying to do is bring around positive change, and by bringing forward the TPPs and the land use strategy that have been sitting there for a while now is a true indication of what I want to get through and work

through. So, I'm more than happy to take all that on board and have discussions on anything you require there.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Just taking it back to third-party appeals; I just looked it up. It was 7 February this year that the then minister for Planning announced intention to table legislation around third-party appeals. Just so my friends at Planning Matters Alliance can sleep well tonight, minister, can you just restate - is it your intention not to table legislation limiting third-party appeals, and that that policy -

**Mr WINTER** - You can't intend not to. You said 'your intention not to'.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Will you be tabling that legislation or that draft bill, or will you let that policy just wither in the bottom drawer?

**Mr VINCENT** - It is still government policy at this point, but I will take it under consideration.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Thank you very much, Also, minister, after a decade-long delay, the Tasmanian State of the Environment Report was released in 2024. The report paints a really alarming picture of an environment under significant strain and facing multiple threats. Of the 29 environmental categories assessed, 16 were found to be getting worse and 11 were in poor condition. It also found that much of Tasmania's environmental legislation is very old and has not been reviewed for decades.

The report recommends that the Tasmanian Government review all resource development and planning legislation, with priority given to the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, the *State Policies and Projects Act 1993* and the *Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994*. Will you be conducting such a review on the resource development and planning legislation in line with the recommendations of the State of the Environment Report?

**Mr VINCENT** - If I could just ask for Mr Ramsay to come forward, from the State Planning Commission? We've had a couple of positive conversations with the State of the Environment Report and where he has taken that, so I will just ask for clarification on where you are at with it.

**Mr RAMSAY** - In relation to the 2029 report: we completed a review of 2024 and we are presently consulting with key stakeholders on the approach that we should follow for 2029.

In relation to that specific recommendation: it's not the role of the Planning Commission to undertake that review. I'm not sure who is actually undertaking the review at the present time. Mr Reid might know, but I certainly don't.

**Mr REID** - My understanding is it's being managed out of the minister for the Environment's office.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - So the minister of Environment's office will liaise, I'm assuming with your office minister, in relation to *Land Use and Planning Approvals Act* in terms of the recommendations arising from the State of the Environment Report. Is that correct?

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - I would like to think so. I will follow through on that for you.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - A further question, if I may, to Mr Ramsay in relation to the 2029 State of the Environment Report, resourcing for that, is that something that you're turning your mind to? Because obviously that was a concern as to why it was delayed for such a long time. The previous report, it was a resourcing issue for the Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC). Have you turned your mind to the budget requirements for that?

**Mr RAMSAY** - At this stage of the process, we've got adequate resources to progress. We've got the commission that oversees it and we've got some resources within the commission to progress. Obviously the State of the Environment Report ramps up when you get to year four and year five, but we're just in year two and scoping out where we're going to go, but the resources are adequate in the current financial year.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Thank you.

**Mr WINTER** - I want to go to Kangaroo Bay, literally because it's a nice place, but also in the policy sense.

There was a second crack at making it a major project and it has now been accepted as being eligible. It's been through the formulation and assessment panel. The proponent is now preparing a Major Project Impact Statement (MPIS). Is there any understanding from government as to the timing of when the Major Project Impact Statement will be received?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'd ask Mr Ramsay first.

**Mr RAMSAY** - Latest advice from the proponents is that it will be sometime in December. Now that may change, but that's the latest advice that we have had. Obviously you put a Major Project Impact Statement on public exhibition and the proponents accept that if it comes in in December then we won't be exhibiting it over the Christmas period to give everybody an opportunity to make representations in relation to the MPIS.

**Mr WINTER** - The website here at state planning says that if the project is approved by a development assessment panel appointed by the commission, construction is anticipated to begin in 2026 with completion 18 to 24 months thereafter. It seems unlikely that's going to happen on the current -

**Mr RAMSAY** - I suppose that's something that's beyond our control. The process will run I would think into the first quarter of 2026 in terms of the approval. What follows from that, if it is approved, of course, I can't comment on.

**Mr WINTER** - In terms of the government's position on this, I understand from having spoken to the mayor that council is now in the Supreme Court with Chambroad or its representatives. Can you clarify, minister, what the government's position is on this because you've got major projects are going through a major projects pathway for the proponent, but the council are seeking under their contractual terms to get the land back. What's the government's position on this and why is it going through this process when the ownership of the land is so unclear? Well, Chambroad owns it at the moment, but according to council there should be handing it back.

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - I will just ask the secretary to clarify those points you just raised.

**Mr LIMKIN** - The management of the Kangaroo Bay process is under the Office of Coordinator-General, and so the Office Coordinator-General is assisting with the facilitation of that process. In relation to planning, the government has declared it a major project and given it to the TPC for an assessment process. We will continue to work with the TPC and the developer on the process on that.

**Mr WINTER** - In terms of going through this process -

**CHAIR** - Mr Winter, last question, just to spread it around.

**Mr WINTER** - Okay, thank you. In terms of going through this process, does the applicant pay an application fee here and is that representative of what it actually costs to go through this process?

**Mr REID** - Sorry?

**Mr WINTER** - In terms of this process for a major project, in this case Chambroad, is there an application fee payable by the proponent and is that application fee generally in line with what it costs to assess the project?

**Mr REID** - There is an application fee that is available under the legislation to lodge an application. To date I can't recall when it's actually been collected, but in terms of the actual assessment of the process, the application fee is obviously for the first part of the process, which is for the minister to determine whether it meets the criteria to be declared a major project and then once declared, it obviously goes through the TPCs process and therefore TPC is probably best to answer in terms of cost recovery models for the cost of the process.

**Mr WINTER** - Thank you, appreciate it.

**Mr VINCENT** - I understand Mr Reid has some information on an earlier question.

**Mr WINTER** - Could we get the rest of that answer first, minister? Is that alright?

**Mr RAMSAY** - Through you, minister, yes, the regulations under the LUPA act actually provide for a three-stage billing process and we have recently invoiced Chambroad for the first and second stage of the process. They just this week asked for a deferral of the payment of the requested amount and we've agreed to the deferral to a later point in time.

**Mr WINTER** - Why was that?

**CHAIR** - Minister, we'll go on because there are a couple of other questions we need to ask. Minister, could you respond to that question? You had the answer to a question?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes.

**Mr REID** - Earlier today, I think in response to you, Mr Winter, I mentioned that the TPPs were provided in late 2023. I've had advice here and an update to that answer that it was June 2024 that that report was finalised and provided to the minister. In terms of the submissions made to the urban growth boundary adjustment, there was obviously a public

## PUBLIC

consultation process and submissions were made to that process that was undertaken earlier this year. Those submissions are available on the Tas Planning website and I'm happy to provide a link with that.

**Mr WINTER** - I understood that, but the question that was on notice, Chair, was about whether representations were made before the decision to go ahead with the urban growth boundary change, rather than as part of the process.

**CHAIR** - Perhaps you will need to keep -

**Mr WINTER** - I have put on notice already. It'd be great if it stayed on notice.

**CHAIR** - Yes. Thank you. I just have a couple of questions. One is in relation to where we're at with the state coastal policy, with particular changes there. There are many people who believe this would be a green light for developers to build on Tasmania's precious coastlines and there's good evidence to suggest that would not be a good idea, so where are we up to with that, minister, please?

**Mr VINCENT** - The Tasmanian government responded to an issue arising from the application of the State Coastal Policy to the Robbins Island wind farm proposal, which identified potential legality risk for other existing developments in Tasmania's coastal areas.

Outcome 1.4.2 of the policy prohibits development and work on the active mobile landforms unless it is for emergency or remediation works to protect land, property and human life. This means that other types of development or works, including boardwalks, fencing, boat launching facilities, bridges, jetties, and golf courses located on active mobile landforms are technically contravening the policy.

In late 2024, the government introduced legislation to validate existing developments, issued in good faith, that may not have complied with the outcome of 1.4.2 of the policy, therefore preventing the threat of legal action being taken against individuals or organisations.

**CHAIR** - So we're not much further on from what I thought. Ms Johnston, you had a last question.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Thank you, Chair. Through you, to Mr Ramsay. Mr Ramsay, can you indicate to the committee the cost of Macquarie Point stadium assessment to the TPC to conduct?

**Mr RAMSAY** - I can. The cost of the assessment, and we've invoiced Macquarie Point Development Corporation, is \$1,303,846.

**Ms JOHNSTON** - Thank you very much.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. We have a minute left. I have one more question in relation to the artificial intelligence factory zone in St Leonards. Could you tell us what sort of zoning is there? Is that like a local government planning zoning?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'm not getting much response.

## **PUBLIC**

**CHAIR** - No, you're not.

**Mr VINCENT** - Okay. I'll take that on board and check that for you.

**CHAIR** - Yes, I'll put that on notice in that case.

The time being 8.25 p.m., we have come to the end of this scrutiny and this evening. I would like to thank you, minister, and everybody who appeared before the committee. Thank you very much. And to committee members, thank you very much.

**The committee adjourned at 8.25 p.m.**